

PRICE 25 CENTS.

Anti-Catholic Series.

No. I.

THE
**HORRIBLE
BOOK:**

EXTRACTS FROM THE WORKS

OF

PETER DENS

ON THE

**NATURE OF ROMAN CATHOLIC
CONFESSION.**

WITH NOTES AND APPENDIX

BY

STEPHALIUS.

The Jordan Publishing Co.,
PHILADELPHIA.

THE HORRIBLE BOOK:
EXTRACTS
FROM THE
THEOLOGICAL WORKS
OF
PETER DENS,
ON
THE NATURE OF
ROMAN CATHOLIC CONFESSION
AND THE
OBLIGATION OF THE SEAL.
A NEW EDITION,
REVISED AND EDITED
BY
STEPHALIUS,
EDITOR OF "MERRY TALES OF THE MONKS."

12TH EDITION.

PHILADELPHIA:
THE JORDAN PUBLISHING COMPANY,
144 NORTH SEVENTH STREET,
1895.

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

TO THE

EDITION OF 1893.

**COPYRIGHT, 1892,
BY JORDAN BROS.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.**

THIS work was first published in New York, in the year 1832, by an anti-Catholic agitator named Sparry, E. Zosinius, a monk of La Trappe, being the translator. It attracted great attention and was the cause of much controversy. The sympathies of the press and public were with the publisher; and the advocates of Catholicism, consequently, met with defeat in their attempts to suppress the book. A revised edition was afterwards printed in Boston. Both of these editions are now very rare. The present issue contains considerable additions, much new matter having been inserted without impairing the original text in the slightest degree.

PREFACE TO THE REVISED EDITION.

THE time is not yet ripe for the plain truth to be spoken. Intolerancy is still rampant. The priest, in the privacy of the Confessional Box, can instil in the penitent's mind thoughts and suggestions of the blackest, foulest, and most debasing character. This can be done with impunity ; yet, if the same prurient advice were scattered abroad, through the agency of the printing-press, the machinery of the law would be employed to prevent its circulation. We are told, by way of apology, that Peter Dens' Theology is written in a dead language, and, therefore, not accessible to the ordinary reader. We are also told that priests are the only proper persons to explain its mysteries and unfold its meaning.

Such an insinuation as the last is an insult to every Protestant in the land. Its fallacy is at once apparent to the meanest intelligence. If this statement is accurate, every non-Catholic is immoral. Are we not informed that priests educate themselves for the purpose of imparting knowledge and advice to the ignorant ? The relations of the sexes form a component part of this education. The aid of the Confessional-Box is employed to further their purposes. Here every secret thought and action is laid bare. Here the sacred tie that binds husband and wife is brushed aside as though it were an empty nothing. In Protestant communities such a state of affairs is unknown. **If a minister**

of any denomination should dare to question a member of his congregation in a manner like that required by the Romish Church there would arise such a storm of indignation that he would at once be driven from his pulpit, and perhaps be treated to a coat of tar and feathers at the hands of indignant fathers, husbands, and brothers.

Yet Rome is permitted to do what best pleases her; none dare gainsay her will. Are Catholics better for such teachings? Is immorality a stranger to them? On the contrary, are Protestants guilty of immoral practices? Are adultery and bastardy more common among them? Let the statistics of crime answer this question. They prove conclusively that Catholic teachings have crowded our prisons as well as our houses of prostitution. Dens' Theology, in its entirety, is to some extent responsible for this condition of affairs. It is an immoral work, and should, therefore, be prohibited. The law does not take into consideration the motive of its compiler; neither does it consider the fact that the book is printed in a dead language. The question at issue is, has the work a tendency to corrupt the morals of the community? If so, its publication is not allowable.

The reader is given here but a slight portion of the original work. It would be impossible to gather in such a compass all the foulness contained in this so-called Moral Theology.

STEPHALIUS.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN OF EVERY DENOMINATION:

You are here presented with a few Extracts from PETER DENS, on the Nature of Confession, and the Obligation of the Seal; and to obviate all doubt of their genuineness and authenticity I will first transcribe part of the dedication of the book from which they have been taken, then give the resolution of the Roman Catholic Bishops, approving of the republication of Peter Dens; and afterwards, as I proceed, set down under each extract the volume and the page from which it has been selected. I have made no attempt to exaggerate, color, or embellish; I give them as I have found them in the original, with the high sanction of Dr. Murray's name. Mr. Coyne's dedication commences thus: "REVERENDISSIMO IN DEO, PATRI AC DOMINO, D. Danieli Murray, Archiepiscopo Dubliniensi, Hiberniaeque Primiati;" and then, after enlarging, in the usual dedicatory style, on the learning and the piety, the mildness and the wisdom, and the many other virtues of the Most Reverend Prelate, he concludes with the following words: "HANC SECUNDAM EDITIONEM THEOLOGIÆ PETRI DENS, EJUS CUM APPROBATIONE SUSCEPTAM, grati in pignus animi ob tot tantaque et officia et beneficia toties collata, è quâ par est, reverentia et observantia, dat, dicat atque dedicat humillimus et obedientissimus servus, Richardus Coyne,

Calendis Maii, 1832." Of which I shall now give the translation: "THIS SECOND EDITION OF THE THEOLOGY OF PETER DENS, UNDERTAKEN WITH THE APPROBATION of the MOST REVEREND LORD AND FATHER IN GOD, LORD DANIEL MURRAY, ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN, and PRIMATE OF IRELAND, is, as a pledge of gratitude for the many and great favors so often conferred, given, inscribed and dedicated, to his LORDSHIP, with all due reverence and respect, by his Lordship's most humble and most obedient servant, Richard Coyne. May 1, 1832." Now the resolution: "At a meeting of the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland, held on the 14th of September, 1808, it was unanimously agreed that *Dens' Complete Body of Theology* was the *best book* on the subject that could be republished." This resolution was subsequently confirmed by another, passed unanimously at a meeting of the Roman Catholic Bishops, held in Dublin on the 25th of February, 1810, viz: "Resolved, That we do hereby confirm and declare our unaltered adherence to the Resolutions unanimously entered into at our last general meeting on the 14th September, 1808."—Wyse's Hist. Cat. Ass., vol. ii., Appen., p. 20. In obedience to these resolutions, and also because "his Grace, Dr. Murray, Dr. Doyle, Dr. Keating, and Dr. Kinsella, made it the conference book for the Clergy of the province of Leinster, the publisher," in order "to advance the cause of *religion and morality* in the Irish Church," was "induced to print a limited number of copies." Morality, indeed! Such, however, is the authority of the book from which our extracts have been taken; but to proceed and take up the seal of Confession, I now subscribe myself, Gentlemen,

Yours, &c.,
E. ZOSINIUS,
Monk of La Trappe.

THE HORRIBLE BOOK

INTRODUCTORY.

"*POPERY*," says Cecil, "is the masterpiece of *Satan*;" and "*Auricular Confession* is the *chef-d'œuvre*" of the whole "mystery of iniquity." Whatever right-minded man peruses this book we here offer to the public will be convinced of the truth of the foregoing remark. Although it is without doubt the most filthy and obscene work that was ever published in the English language, it is still a work that *every Father and Husband in these United States should read*. Hitherto the strength of Romanism has consisted, in a great measure, in the extremity of its abominations. The enormities of the Papal Hierarchy have so far exceeded all other earthly wickedness that the minds of most Protestants have turned from their contemplation with loathing and disgust. This little work, comprising a few extracts only from the voluminous original in Latin, affords a striking example of this. Men have preferred that their wives and daughters should have its atrocious doctrines breathed into their ears by the polluted and polluting lips of licentious priests in the secret chambers of the confessional, to the book itself being received into their families at home. And yet we defy any sensible man to peruse its pages and not be forced to acknowledge that any woman who submits to undergo the ordeal it requires of every member of the Papal Church must become a mere toy in the hands of her confessor.

If she retains her virtue at all, it must be only by the forbearance of the priest. What this forbearance is, let the past and present state of female morality in every Popish country on earth teach us. But we need neither example nor ocular demonstration to convince us what the consequences inevitably must be of permitting a class of idle, luxurious men to exist amongst us who are certainly no *better*, to say the least, than an average of other men, and of allowing them the unbounded

opportunities and the unlimited facilities that the Catholic priesthood possess, through the confessional, of corrupting the purity of their female penitents.

The system has evidently been perfected to promote that very object. There can be no question of this fact with those who will take the pains and time necessary to study it. And this is nothing new in the world. It has always been a leading feature in the institution of a pagan priesthood from the earliest ages. Their systems have ever been perfected on a plan that would most effectually administer to the three great leading propensities of unregenerated human nature; namely, the gratification of the love of power, of avarice, and of lust.

The Papal system was founded on this principle. It is the gratification of these ruling passions that constitutes the bond of union that has enabled the Hierarchy of Rome for so many ages to trample upon and so grossly to insult mankind. Ere the world, ere mankind and womankind, are rescued out of their unhallowed grasp, men must come to understand this. They must learn that there is not a particle of true religion, so far as the Hierarchy is concerned, in the Papal system. They must learn that all the outside show of sanctity that Popish priests so well know how to assume is but a necessary ingredient of the imposture which they, in common with all other pagan priesthood that have gone before them, or which now exist on earth, are practising on the ignorant masses of mankind. It is this assumption of superabounding sanctity that gives them such a control over their superstitious votaries.

Popery is simply infidelity in disguise. If it were not so, its priesthood would never dare to insult God with such mummeries as they do. There is not a well-read or a reflecting Popish priest on earth who has any belief whatever in nine-tenths of the creed of his Church; there is not one of them who believes in its doctrine of the mass, the infallibility of the Pope, the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, or the power of the clergy to remit the penalty due for sin. I repeat that there is not one of them who believes in any of these things, as any sensible man must be convinced who thoroughly studies and reflects on the nature of the Papacy and its Hierarchy, notwithstanding the hypocritical and audacious pretensions of its priests. This every American should understand, that he may know how to distinguish between a religious fraternity and a mere political combination of designing and un-

principled voluptuaries acting under a false name, and having for their object the utter destruction of all that we in America hold dear.

Again we say, *Let every American father and husband read this book—preface, appendix, and all—nay, more, let them see that it is placed in the hands of every husband and father in our land who are the deluded dupes of the Romish priesthood.* It cannot but have an effect on many of them. It may convey one ray of light, at least, to their benighted and sealed-up minds, and that ray may prompt them to further inquiries after truth. Let the priesthood rage as they may, it will promote the cause of righteousness and truth: again we repeat, let every Catholic father and husband be furnished with a copy of *Dens*.

ROMAN PRIEST'S DEFENCE OF DEN'S THEOLOGY.

It will be noticed, in the correspondence attached to this publication that passed between Peter S. Casserly, the Catholic bookseller in New York, and the editor of the *Journal of Commerce*, that the former essays to defend the morality taught in Dens's work on the ground that it was never intended to be translated out of the dead language in which it was first written. (That is, only so far as Roman priests might find it convenient and advisable to explain its tenets to their penitents in the confessional.) Thus we have it acknowledged that the language and sentiments that are breathed into the ears of American wives and daughters by the notoriously lecherous and licentious bachelor priesthood of Rome in the secret confessional are too filthy to be explained in English to their fathers and husbands. Was there ever such an outrageous insult as this offered to the understandings of intelligent and thinking men? It speaks of itself volumes against the corruption and villany of Romanism. But it seems that Casserly is not the only Papist who takes the same ground in relation to Dens's work. A correspondent of the *Providence Journal*, who, it is well known, is a Roman priest of much celebrity in his church, in a controversial article that appeared in that paper under the date of November 3, 1853, holds the following language in speaking of this same work:—

“A few words more for the Theology of Peter Dens. In the first place, I admit that there are things contained in that

book which are unfit to be read *at all*; but I deny that this is a reason why they should not be written. There are some parts of the Bible which are not expunged when it is put into the hands of a young miss, although they are not *altogether* very modest in their description. What, upon the whole, are the enormities charged against Dens? He describes certain crimes of which human nature may be guilty, and he gives instruction how those who have had the misfortune to fall into them may be treated when they come with humble and contrite hearts to the minister of Jesus Christ to make a full and sincere confession of them. Like a skilful surgeon, he describes the ulcer and the mode of eradicating it. He gives advice as to the best mode of withdrawing those who are habituated to sin from their evil ways, and establishing them in the way of grace. Who can have objection to this? Moreover, this work was written in a dead language, consequently not intended to be read but by those to whom such crimes would be made known; and never was it translated into English until the No-Popery ranters, such as *Sparry, Sentinel & Co.*, pounced upon it and opened it to the world, the ladies not excluded."

THE REV. PETER DENS'S THEOLOGY.

No man who regards the purity of his wife and children, or other female members of his family, should fail to peruse this book. And never would he, after perusing it, permit a female member of his family to frequent that *Hell* upon earth, a Roman Catholic Confessional, or allow them on any pretence whatever to hold any communion or intimacy with Romish Priests, or their female jackals, the "Sisters of Charity" or of "Mercy," or those of any other numerous orders of monkery that are of late become so plenty in the United States of America. As nauseous and as outrageous to all decency as we know the matter contained in this book to be, we are still confident in the belief that it should be read by every head of a family in the Union. For, unless we probe the gigantic ulcer to its very core, that is now gradually eating into the vitals of our Republic, in vain will be our attempts to eradicate it.

NOTICES OF THE PRESS, ETC.

"Peter Dens was an eminent and authentic Catholic writer on Theology, and his works have been recently published with

the express sanction of the Pope. Whatever he states to be the doctrine of that Church may therefore be relied on as correct. This little volume presents a translation of so much of his work as treats on Confession; and a striking specimen it is of horrible perversions and abominations. If anything were needed to confirm the identity of Rome with the accursed Antichrist of Scripture, this would be sufficient to do it."—*New York Evangelist*, leading organ of the Presbyterian Church, New School.

"We advise those who are ignorant of the devices and machinations of the Mother of Harlots to read this book, and if they are not satisfied that she sustains the character given her in the Revelation, we know not what kind of evidence would convince them."—*Baptist Advocate*, leading organ of the Baptist Church, published in Philadelphia and New York.

"This little volume furnishes, from the writings of Dens, accredited as standard authority by the Romanists, and used in their Theological Seminaries, a delineation of the true character of the confessional. The extracts are given in double columns, one containing the original Latin, and the other the translation. It contains a sad and humiliating exhibition of the abominations of the confessional."—*Christian Intelligencer*, leading organ of the Dutch Reformed Church.

The following is from the *New York Journal of Commerce*:

"The work of Dens is a large one, published with the sanction of the Pope and the Catholic Church, and sold here by the Catholic booksellers in open day. This little book of extracts has been printed from the original, purchased as above, so that its verity as an exposition of the villany of the Romish hierarchy is susceptible of most positive proof. If it is not so, then Mr. Sparry deserves all the odium which can be poured upon him. The truth in the case can be easily ascertained; and if Mr. Sparry has spoken it, the torrent of public indignation should be poured, not upon him for disclosing the iniquity, but upon those who have planned and executed, and written and published at length the rules of practice so shocking. We have looked into the little book of Mr. Sparry, and read a few of his quotations from Dens. They show that nothing is too obscene to be made a theological question, and inquired into as sin or no sin. The man who wrote the book must have had a mind sunk far beneath the pollution of the

Five Points, and must have written for the use of men whose licentious appetites could never be satiated.

“ Much as we regret that such a disclosure should be necessary, still, if Mr. Sparry’s statements are true, *the exposure is necessary*. The public ought to know what questions are put to their Catholic servant girls, or *authorized* to be put by the ‘Mother of Harlots.’ We commend this subject to the investigation of all men whose families go to the confessional. Let indignation overwhelm the guilty, whoever they may be. There may be a depravity so abominable that it cannot be disclosed; yet the community are not safe while such depravity is covered up. If Mr. Sparry has sought to deceive the public, let him be driven from society. If, on the contrary, he has but exposed the wickedness of Romish Priests, let *them* be assigned to their proper place. Get *Dens’s Theology*, as sold in the Catholic bookstores, and ‘see who is the wretch.’”

This article stirred up the wrath of a great writer and champion of the Romanists, who sent the following letter to the *Journal of Commerce* :—

“ Messrs. Editors: Trusting that you would not intentionally misrepresent the actions of your neighbors, or distort facts to their prejudice, may I request permission to correct a few mistakes made in one of your editorials this week? You assert that *Dens’s Theology* is for sale at all the Catholic bookstores in New York.* As one of the booksellers alluded to, allow me, without intending the slightest offence, to tell you the assertion is not true; as I can state, from a knowledge of the facts, that a copy of *Dens’s Theology* could not be had at any Catholic bookstore in the city.† Not, however, for a moment, admitting hereby that there would be anything wrong or improper in keeping on sale that or any similar work written, and, as it were, locked up in a dead language, and adapted

* “No, we don’t; you put in the ‘all’ yourself.”—*Eds. Journal of Commerce*.

† “Then it is because the priests or their friends have withdrawn them. We know that a set of the works was bought at John Doyle’s not a month ago, and the bill received is at hand, if wanted for evidence. And we know that at both there and at your own bookstore the work has been offered freely for sale within a few days. Do you think to humbug the Yankees with such falsehood as this? The book was freely offered at the Catholic bookstores. We stated that fact. You then suppressed the sale, and proclaim that we have asserted a falsehood. This may be good Romanism, but we call it lying in this country.”—*Editors of the Journal of Commerce*.

solely to the use of clergymen having a charge of souls; but merely wishing to set your readers right on a matter intended to produce wrong impressions in the community.

“ Like wine and other good creatures of God, it is not in the use of *Dens*’ or any other similar production the evil can be apprehended, but in the abuse. Written in a language which renders it a sealed book to the multitude, it is only for the use of the few selected for the ministry and intrusted with the direction of souls. For these, from the nature of their calling, it must, among other matters, contain much on that most difficult of all sciences—the science of the human heart—its weakness, its proclivity to evil, its manifold errors, its general depravity, its secret crimes throughout the various and complicated folds or wayward affections, etc.

“ As physicians, surgeons, and anatomists find it necessary to study and consult text-books peculiar to their avocations, and in many cases unsuited or unfit for the perusal of the multitude, so it is with the physician of the mind—the soul of man—he above all others requires text-books on duties and subjects infinitely more difficult, and by no means adapted to the perusal of the many; and lest these books should, like other things consecrated to a particular use, be rendered liable to perversion or abuse, they are, as already mentioned, always written and published under the seal of a dead language, accessible to comparatively few.

“ If, therefore, any evil-minded person, more anxious to gratify rancorous malignity towards a portion of his fellow-Christians than desirous of advancing the cause of truth, justice, or morality, will maliciously unseal a book of this description by translating into the vernacular tongue isolated passages, culled out with the illaudable diligence of the perverted astronomer who could see nothing of the sun but its spots, and thus exhibit a frightful caricature to the vulgar gaze of the young, the idle, and the inexperienced, such person is most unquestionably guilty of a high misdemeanor against the well-being of society, and indictable under any law or ordinance prohibiting the circulation of improper books. I am, Mr. Editor, yours with due regard,

“ PATRICK CASSERLY.

“ 108 NASSAU STREET.”

This letter brought forth the following remarks from the Editor of the *Journal of Commerce* :—

“ This is a most astounding letter. Mr. Casserly is a lead-

ing Roman Catholic, and his letter is good authority for the opinion of his sect.

“ If there were lack of proof that the human heart is as depraved as he says it is, Dens’s Theology would supply that lack, and would prove that the most festering and odious existences of that depravity are to be found in the Romish priesthood. The book is accommodated to the depravity of the confessor, not of the penitent. Will men send their wives to a priest to be inquired of as to all the details which Roman lust can think of, with some that never entered the mind of a Protestant? And all these to be asked over in every possible form, the penitent wife to be told this is right and holy, and that is unholy, and compelled to answer every question on pain of being refused absolution.

“ Will men send their daughters to the same ordeal, and that to priests whose rule, as laid down in the book, is, that if they can go through with all that is prescribed, and themselves ‘not fall more than three or four times a month,’ then they are fit for the office; but if they fall oftener than this they ought to doubt the strength of their faith, and question the propriety of their remaining in the office? In other words, a priest who only seduces four women a month is a good confessor.

“ If he goes beyond that, he ought to doubt the propriety of continuing, and beyond the culprit’s own personal opinion of himself the only appeal is to the Pope, for His Holiness reserves these things to his own personal jurisdiction. O, the whole thing is an accursed sink of moral pollution, such as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of any man to conceive, except the heart of Romish priests. Such is the end of Hierarchy and a blind faith.”

The following is from the *Journal of Commerce*, Nov. 30, 1843:—

“ Poor Sparry has come very near getting into prison—for what? For publishing extracts from an authentic Catholic book? If the book is so bad, if the questions are so horrible, what must we think of a sect with whom such a book is authority, and by whose priests such questions are asked? But if any one doubts Dens’s book, let him look at *M. Gavin’s* Protestant, the Glasgow octavo edition, vol. 2, and in the appendix he will find full confirmation of the atrocities of the confessional.”

EXTRACTS

FROM

DENS’ THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

DE SIGILLO CONFESSIONIS.

ON THE SEAL OF CONFESSION.

Quid est sigillum confessionis sacramentalis?

R. Est obligatio seu debitum celandi ea quæ ex sacramentali confessione cognoscuntur.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 218.

An potest dari casus, in quo licet frangere sigillum sacramentale?

R. Non potest dari; quamvis ab eo penderet vita aut salus hominis, aut etiam interitus Reipublicæ: neque summus Pontifex in eo dispensare potest: ut proinde hoc sigilli arcanum magis liget, quam obligatio jura-menti, voti, secreti naturalis, &c., idque ex voluntate Dei positiva.

What is the seal of sacramental confession?

Answer. It is the obligation or duty of concealing those things which are learned from sacramental confession.—*Dens*, vol. 6, p. 218.

Can a case be given in which it is lawful to break the sacramental seal?

Answer. It cannot; although the life or safety of a man depended thereon, or even the destruction of the commonwealth; nor can the Supreme Pontiff give dispensation in this; so that, on that account, this secret of the seal is more binding than the obligation of an oath, a vow, a natural secret, &c., and that by the positive will of God.

Strong as this language is, you shall soon see it all explained away, and nothing left but an empty name. The priest is

bound to secrecy only as it promotes his views and supports his interests: when it militates against these, his secrecy is as fragile as any sealing-wax.

Quid igitur respondere debet Confessarius interrogatus super veritate, quam per solam confessionem sacramentalem novit?

R. Debet respondere, se nescire eam, et si opus est, idem juramento confirmare.

Obj. Nullo casu licet mentiri, atqui Confessarius ille mentiretur, quia scit veritatem, ergo, &c.

Therefore he ought not to say on his word, much less his oath, that he does not know what he well knows.

R. Nego minorem; quia talis Confessarius interrogatur ut homo, et respondet ut homo; jam autem non scit ut homo; illam veritatem, quamvis sciat ut Deus, ait S. Th., q. ii., art. 1 ad 3, et iste sensus sponte inest responsione, nam quando extra confessionem interrogatur vel respondet, consideratur ut homo.

The minor proposition is that "the priest would be guilty of a lie in saying that he does not know what he has heard in confession by denying that Dens teaches, on the authority of

What answer, then, ought a Confessor give when questioned concerning a truth which he knows from sacramental confession only?

Answer. HE OUGHT TO ANSWER THAT HE DOES NOT KNOW IT; AND, IF IT BE NECESSARY, TO CONFIRM THE SAME WITH AN OATH.

Objection. It is in no case lawful to tell a lie; but that the Confessor would be guilty of a lie, because he knows the truth, therefore, &c.

Answer. I deny the minor; because such a Confessor is questioned as a man, and answers as a man; but now he does not know that truth as a man, though he knows it as God, says St. Thomas, (q. ii., art. 1, 3;) and that is the free and natural meaning of the answer, for, when he is asked, or when he answers outside confession, he is considered as a man.

St. Thomas, that the priest is not guilty of a perjury, or even of a lie, when he swears, upon the Holy Evangelists, that he does not know what he, at the same time, admits that he well knows, because, forsooth, what he heard as God, he denies as man; but, as the Confessor, as you soon shall see, is bound to secrecy by no religious or sacramental obligation at all, because the seal relates only to the penitent or sinner, (quia sigillum habet relationem ad pœnitentem seu ad peccatorem,) but merely by considerations of utility,—for he is silent only when not urged by a preponderating utility to reveal, (abstinendum his narrationibus, quando nulla utilitatis causa movet,)—it clearly follows that the priest does swear falsely, urged solely by motives of utility to conceal, lest auricular confession should become odious, and the practice be abandoned.

Quid si directe a Confessario quæratur, utrum illud sciatur per confessionem sacramentalem?

R. Hoc casu nihil oportet respondere: ita Stey. cum Sylvio; sed interrogatio rejicienda est tanquam impia: vel etiam posset absolute, non relative ad petitionem dicere: ego nihil scio, quia vox *ego* restringit ad scientiam humanam.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 219.

Quid si quispiam peccata sua Confessario aperiat hac intentione, ut Confessarium irrideat, vel ut eum pertrahat in societatem exequendi malam intentionem?

R. Non oritur sigillum, quia confessio non est sacramentalis. Ita Romæ, judicatum fuisse, refert Dominicus Soto, in casu, quo quidam

What if a confessor were directly asked whether he knows it through sacramental confession?

Answer. In this case he ought to give no answer, (so Steyart and Sylvius,) but reject the question as impious; or he could even say, *absolutely*, not *relatively*, to the question, I know nothing, because the word *I* restricts to his human knowledge.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 219.

But if any one should disclose his sins to a Confessor, with the intention of mocking him, or of drawing him into an alliance with him in the execution of a bad intention?

Answer. The seal does not result therefrom, because the confession is not sacramental. Thus, as Dominick Soto relates, it has been de-

accesserat Confessarium intendens eum pertrahere in conjurationis crimen contra Pontificem.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 220.

You have been told above that the seal could not be violated, even if it were to save the state from destruction; but you now perceive it has been violated to save the Pope from a conspiracy. If it is violated to save the Pope from some, perhaps, fabricated story of a conspiracy, how much sooner to promote the interests of the Church, upon which the Pope himself depends for his power and his existence? Read on, and you'll see, even from their own account, what a precious humbug the doctrine of the seal is.

Denique indirecte ad sigillum reducuntur omnia, per quorum revelationem sacramentum redderetur odiosum juxta mores patriæ et temporum varietates: et ita Steyart de Pœn., § 13, num. I. p. 226. Ex. Wig. animadvertisit, aliqua uno tempore adversari sigillo, quæ alio tempore non habentur ut talia.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 222.

An Confessarius narrans peccata quæ in confessione audavit, agit contra sigillum?

R. Si nullo modo, nequidem in generali, peccator, seu persona possit agnosci, neque etiam ullum præjudicium ipsi ex eo obvenire possit, non agit contra sigillum

cided at Rome, in a case in which some one went to a Confessor with the intention of drawing him into a criminal conspiracy against the Pope.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 220.

In fine, all things are reduced indirectly to the seal, by the revealing of which the sacrament would be rendered odious, according to the manners of the country and the changes of the times; and thus Steyart observes from Wiggers, that some things are at one time opposed to the seal, which at another time are NOT considered as such.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 222.

Does a Confessor relating the sins which he has heard in confession act contrary to the seal?

Answer. If the sinner or person can by no means be discovered, not even in general, nor any prejudice to himself happen therefrom, he does not act contrary to

quia sigillum habet relationem ad pœnitentem sive ad peccatorem.—*Dens*, tom. 6, 222.

Propterea provide Doctores monent, ab hisce narrationibus abstinendum, quando nulla utilitatis causa movet, propter scandala, dum populus existimat Confessarium recordari singulorum peccata: et propter periculum remotum et suspiciones aliorum. Narrat Medina, lib. 2, chap. 4. Confessarium sic manifestasse personam adulteram, dum primo dixerat, primam pœnitentem fuisse confessam ad ulterium, postea imprudentur nominavit personam, quæ ejus prima penitens fuerat. Quia propter etiam in petendo consilio præstat casum simpliciter proponere, non declarando illum sibi in confessione occurrere.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 222.

You have been told that the obligation of the seal is more binding than the obligation of an oath, but you are here told that it ceases to bind when the priest is moved by reason of utility; *a fortiori*, as the logicians say, an oath ceases to bind when he is moved by reason of utility.

Quinam obligationem sigilli sacramentalis contrahunt?

the seal, because the seal has reference to the penitent or sinner.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 222.

Wherefore the Doctors providently advise that we should abstain from these narrations, *when not moved to it by reason of utility*, on account of the scandal, were people to suppose that the Confessor recollects the sins of each individual; and on account of the *remote danger and suspicions of others*. Medina tells us, book 2, chap. 4, that a Confessor had thus discovered on an adulteress by first saying that his first penitent had confessed an adultery, and afterward imprudently naming the person who had been his first penitent. Wherefore, even in asking advice, it is better to state the case simply, without declaring that it has occurred to him in confession.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 222.

What persons contract the obligation of the sacramental seal?

R. Omnes illi ad quos pervenit notitia ex confessione, mediate vel immédiata, licite vel illicite.

Hoc modo tenentur sigillo interpres in confessione, et illi, qui circa confessionale considentes aliquid per accidens audiunt. Peccant autem illi, qui voluntarie auscultant vel audiunt. Similiter illi tenentur sigillo, quibus Confessarius sine licentia pœnitentis revelavit.

When the penitent cannot speak any of the languages understood by the priest, he is obliged to employ an interpreter.

Here it is admitted that Confessors *do* reveal without the permission of the penitent.

An pœnitens ligatur sigillo sacramentali ad celandum ea, quæ Confessarius eidem dixit?

R. Negative, quia Confessarii dicta non sunt confessio sacramentalis.

Pœnitens tamen tenetur secreto naturali, quando, illa intentione dicta sunt a Confessario: quod supponitur, quando reverentia sacramenti, vel honor Confessarii, vel aliae circumstantiæ id requirunt: proinde peccant, qui Confessarii dicta enarent

Answer. All those who have got their knowledge from confession meditately or immediately, lawfully or unlawfully.

In this manner interpreters in confession are bound by the seal, and those who, sitting about the confessional, accidentally hear anything. But they commit sin who voluntarily listen or hear. In like manner, they are bound by the seal *to whom the Confessor has revealed WITHOUT the license of the penitent.*

Is the penitent bound by the sacramental seal to conceal those things which the Confessor has said to the same?

Answer. No; because the Confessor's words are not sacramental confession.

The penitent, however, is bound by a natural secret, since the words were spoken with that intention by the Confessor, which is supposed, since *the reverence of the sacrament, or the honor of the Confessor, or other circumstances require that:*

mere ad risum vel ad contemptum ejusdem.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 231.

An Confessarius de licentia pœnitentis potest manifestare ea quæ audivit in confessione ejusdem?

R. Dupliciter hæc licentia dari potest: Primo ita, ut per eam licentiam det simul Confessario alium cognoscendi modum humanum extra-sacramentalem, ut Confessarius tunc ea cognoscat etiam tanquam homo, puta si pœnitens dicat: ea, quæ confessus sum, dico tibi extra confessionem: et hoc casu nihil obstare videtur, quin Confessarius ea manifestet (modo absit scandalum) quia non utitur scientia sigilli, sed alia, cognitione humana: et ita sigillum non attingitur.

Obj. Pœnitens non repetivit ea omnia extra confessionem, ergo, scientia illa non est extra sigillum.

R. Illa licentia sic data continet æquivalenter seu virtualiter repetitionem; deinde per illam licentiam scientia

wherefore they commit sin who relate the words of the Confessor merely for laughter, or through a contempt of him.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 231.

Can a Confessor, with license of the penitent, disclose what he has heard in that penitent's confession?

Answer. This license can be given in a two-fold way: 1st, so as by that license he may give the Confessor, at the same time, another human extra-sacramental mode of knowing it, in order that the Confessor may then know it even as a man: suppose if the penitent were to say, What I have confessed to you, I tell you without confession: and in this case nothing prevents the confessor from disclosing (*provided there be no scandal*), because he does not use the knowledge of the seal, but another sort of knowledge, namely, human: and thus the seal is not touched.

Objection. The penitent has not repeated all those things without confession, and therefore that knowledge is not without the seal.

Answer. That license thus given equivalently or virtually contains the repetition; besides, by that license the

sigilli accepit alium modum extra-sacramentalem quod sufficit.

Obj. Mali sacerdotes possent sic abuti sigillo, dicendo, se habere licentiam.

R. S. Th. q. ii, a. 4 ad 3, incumbit eis probatio receptæ licentiae; sed creditur Confessario jurante, se obtinuisse licentiam pœnitente. La Croix, lib. 6, n. 1959.

Secundo: licentia illa dari potest ita, ut res, quæ, per Confessarium alteri revelatur, transeat cum et sub sigillo sacramentali, ut etiam iste, ad quem notitia transit, obligetur sigillo: et de hoc casu videtur dicendum cum Suarez disp. 33, sect. 5, n. q. p. 443, quod pœnitens possit licite et valide talem licentiam dare Confessario, quia sigillum obligat in favorem pœnitentis, qui hoc extendere potest ad alias personas, sicuti dum confitetur per interpretem: et in hoc casu iste, cui Confessarius ex licentia pœnitentis communicat ligatur sigillo confessionis.

knowledge of the seal receives a different extra-sacramental mode, which is sufficient.

Objection. Bad priests could thus abuse the seal by saying they had liberty.

St. Thomas answers, it is incumbent on them to prove they have received the license; but *a Confessor is believed when he swears he has obtained license from the penitent.* La Croix, lib. 6, n. 1959.

Secondly, that license can be so given *as that the thing which is revealed by the Confessor to another may pass with and under the sacramental seal*, so that even he to whom the knowledge passes may be bound by the seal: and with respect to this case, it seems we must say, with Suarez, that the penitent can lawfully and validly give such license to the Confessor, because the seal obliges in favor of the penitent, who can extend this to other persons, in the same way, as when he confesses by an interpreter; and in this case he to whom the Confessor, with the license of the penitent, communicates the knowledge, is bound by the seal of confession.

And so he to whom it passes may of course pass it on by the same license to a fourth, with and under the sacramental seal; and thus the confession or peccadilloes of even a fair lady may pass, under one pretence or another, to all the priests in the kingdom, even to the Pope at Rome, if the interests of the Church should require to transmit it to such a distance.

Obj. Sigillum obligat etiam ob reverentiam sacramenti, ergo pœnitens non potest licentiam dare. Probatum a pari: sicut Clericus non potest cedere juri Canonis, et dare licentiam, ut percutiatur ab altero.

Objection. The seal obliges even through reverence of the sacrament; therefore the penitent cannot give license. This is proved by an "*a pari*" argument; as a Cleric cannot resign the right or privilege of the Canon, and give license to another to strike him.

An "*a pari*" argument is one in which the proposition is proved by citing a parallel case, thus:—

Right. Si quis suadente diabolo hujus sacrilegii reatum incurrit, quod in Clericum vel Monachum violentes manus injecerit, Anathematis vinculo subjaceat: et nullus Episcoporum ilium præsumat absolvere (nisi mortis urgente periculo).

Vocatur hoc privilegium.

An percutiens liberatur a censura, si Clericus dederit licentiam et cesserit privilegio Canonis?

R. Nullo modo, quia Clericus invalide et illicite cedit illi privilegio, quia statutum est pro honore et reverentia

Right. If any one, at the suggestion of the devil, should be guilty of the sacrilege of laying violent hands on a Cleric or a Monk, let him lie beneath the bond of anathema; and let none of the Bishops presume to absolve him, unless urged by the danger of his dying.

This is called the privilege.

Is the striker freed from the censure if the Cleric should have given liberty, and resigned the privileges of the Canon?

Answer. By no means, because the Cleric invalidly and unlawfully resigns that privilege, because it was estab-

totius Cleri, cui ipse cedere non potest.—No. 227, v. 6.

But to continue:—

R. Disparitas est, quod illa licentia Clerici non cederet in favorem Cleri nec istius Clerici, sed directe contra finem Canonis seu legis; sed licentia illa pœnitentis est in favorem pœnitentis et sacramenti, nam per hanc sacramentum pœnitentiae non redditur odiosum, sed amabile pœnitentibus, eo quod possint secretum sigilli extendere.

Notant etiam Du Jardin sec. 9, § 3, n. 5, Suarez d. 34, § 4, n. 12, Antoine t. 4, Poen. c. 4, q. 5, Sylvius in q. ii, a. 2, pœnitentem posse aliquando obligari ad similem aliquam licentiam concedendum, alias non absolvendum.

By saying, in reply to the objector's argument, "a pari," that there is a disparity in the cases, he denies that the seal is binding on the Confessor through reverence of the sacrament; but he has told us not long since that the penitent, through reverence of the sacrament, is bound not to disclose what she has heard from the priest in the confessional; so that, while the penitent is taught that she is bound to conceal, through reverence of the sacrament, what has been said by her Confessor, the priest is taught that he is bound only by his interests; he is silent when impelled by no preponderating interest (quando

lished for the honor and the reverence of the whole clergy, which he cannot of himself resign.

Answer. There is a disparity, because that license of the Cleric *would not turn out to the favor of the Clergy, nor of that Cleric*, but directly against the canon or law; but that license of the penitent is in favor of the penitent and of the sacrament, for by this the sacrament of penance *is not rendered odious, but lovely to the penitents, because they can thereby EXTEND the secret of the seal.*

Du Jardin, also, and Suarez, Antoine, and Sylvius remark, that a *penitent can sometimes be compelled to concede some such license, or OTHERWISE be NOT absolved.*

nulla utilitatis causa movet); he is silent only when his babbling would render confession odious. It is also to be remarked that, while he *begins* by saying that the priest, by the positive will of God, is bound to an inviolable secrecy, he *ends* by teaching, through his explanations and exceptions, that he is religiously or sacramentally bound to no secrecy at all. On the contrary, though he answers the question, "Is the penitent bound by sacramental seal to conceal those things which the Confessor has said to the same?"—though he answers that question in the negative, he teaches that she is bound, through reverence of the sacrament, to an inviolable secrecy. Thus they would impose on men by their general propositions.

Penance is the Roman Catholic translation of *pœnitentia*, which Protestants more correctly render by the word *repentance*.

An is, a quo Confessarius cum licentia pœnitentis petivet consilium, obligatur secreto sigilli?

R. Distinguo; si priori modo suprascripto licentia sit concessa, non obligatur.

Si posteriori modo sit data, obligatur sigillo, quod ordinarie supponi debet, saltem quando res est odiosa, addit La Croix lib. 6, page 2, n. 1597, eo casu, alteri esse notificandum quod res communicetur sub sigillo.

An Confessario licitum est loqui pœnitenti, extra confessionem, de auditis ab ipso in confessione?

Is he from whom the Confessor, with the license of the penitent, has asked advice, obliged by the secret of the seal?

Answer. I distinguish; if the license has been given in the first way above written, he is not obliged.

If it has been given in the latter way, he is obliged by the seal, which ought *ordinarily* to be supposed; at least since the thing is odious. La Croix adds, that in this case it should be notified to the other that the circumstance is *communicated* under the seal.

Is it lawful for a Confessor to speak to a penitent, without confession, on the things which he has heard from the penitent in confession?

R. Negative, quia Confessarius extra confessionem agit ut homo. Id tamen licebit, si pœnitens det licentiam secundum prædicta; censetur autem pœnitens eam dare, si ipse primus interroget vel loquatur Confessario de iis, quæ in confessione aperuit.

An immediate post absolutionem datam Confessarius potest adhuc loqui pœnitente de iis, quæ in confessione exposita sunt?

R. Affirm.: quamdiu scilicet pœnitens est in Confessionali, et in quantum convenit pœnitenti, quia monere, instruere, corrigere, consulere spectent ad complementum ejusdem functionis sacramentalis, sicut licet imponere satisfactionem post absolutionem.—*Dens*, tom. 6, pp. 232-4.

An Confessario licitum est uti scientia accepta ex sola confessione sacramentali alterius?

Quamvis semper sit illicitum frangere sigillum, quæritur tamen: utrum sit contra reverentiam sigilli,

Answer. No, because the Confessor outside the confession acts as a man. However, it will be lawful if the penitent give license according to what has been previously said; but the penitent is supposed to give it if he should first interrogate or speak to the Confessor about what he has disclosed in confession.

Can the Confessor, immediately after giving absolution, as yet speak to the penitent about what has been exposed in confession?

Answer. Yes, as long indeed as the penitent is in the confessional, and as far as it is suitable to the penitent; because to advise, to instruct, to correct, to consult, tend to the completion of that same sacramental function, just as it is allowed to impose satisfaction after absolution.—*Dens*, v. 6, pp. 232-4.

Is it lawful for a Confessor to avail himself of that knowledge which he has acquired solely from the sacramental confession of another?

Although it is always unlawful to break the seal, however it is inquired whether it is contrary to the reverence

agere aliquid vel omittere aliquid ex illa scientia, quod alias Confessarius non fecisset? Ad quod respondeatur, id aliquando esse contra sigillum, aliquando non esse.

Quandonam est contra sigillum uti scientia confessionis?

R. Quando subest periculum, ne aliquid directe vel indirecte reveletur de confessione personæ cognitæ. Imo, quamvis nullum tale periculum appareat, neque etiam sciatur, Confessarium uti scientia confessionis, si equidem illud cederet in gravamen, verum vel apprehensum, pœnitentis vel complicis, ageretur contra sigillum, in quantum confessio sic posset reddi odiosa: v. g. si Confessarius ex sola cognitione confessionis neget pœnitenti vel complici testimonium morum.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 235.

Here it is distinctly stated that, when it is unattended with danger, the priest may avail himself of the knowledge acquired from confession; and you shall presently see that when he learns from confession that females are given to certain sins, he sometimes contrives to avail himself of *that* knowledge too.

of the seal to do anything or to omit anything on account of that knowledge, which the Confessor could otherwise not have done. To which it is answered, *it is sometimes contrary to the seal, and sometimes NOT.*

When is it contrary to the seal to make use of the knowledge of confession?

Answer. When it is attended with danger, lest anything be revealed, directly or indirectly, respecting the confession of a *known* person. Nay, although no such danger appears, and although it be not known that the Confessor avails himself of the knowledge of confession, yet if it might turn out to be a real or apprehended grievance to the penitent or his accomplice, it would be acting contrary to the seal, inasmuch as confession would thus be rendered odious; for instance, if a Confessor should, from the sole knowledge of confession, deny a penitent or his accomplice a testimonium of morals.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 235.

This passage concerning a *Testimonium of morals* is indeed an important one. Great value has been set in this country upon getting what is called a character from a priest. The culprit from the dock exclaims, "My Lord, I'll get a character from the priest;" and we ourselves often say to the laborer and the servant, "Bring me a character from your priest." As the priest hears the confessions of his parishioners, he must know the honest and the dishonest, the moral and the immoral; and as a Christian pastor, bound by his office to discourage vice and to encourage virtue, to restrain the dishonest and to promote the honest, he surely will not recommend any whom he knows to be unworthy. Such has been our reasoning—such has been the general impression. Silly people! What does Dens say? That the priest cannot refuse a testimonium of moral character, even to the most vicious, lest confession should become odious, and the confessionals deserted.

Quandonam licitum est uti scientia in confessione acquisita?

R. Quando peccator nullo modo manifestatur, nullum quoque gravamen ei aut alteri generatur, nihil denique intervenit, quod odiosam reddit confessionem.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 238.

From the frequency with which this question (*When is it lawful?*) has been asked, it would appear that the compiler's object was to impress upon the minds of the priests their right to break the seal whenever it opposed itself to their interests, or to the execution of their designs.

The answer to this question shows in what sense the Pope is said to be unable to dispense with the obligation of the seal; for, if the priests were allowed openly to reveal, confession would cease, and all its advantages to the priesthood be lost; and who would be the fool to grant a dispensation to knock up the most profitable branch of his own trade?

When is it lawful for the Confessor to make use of the knowledge acquired in confession?

Answer. When the sinner is by no means discovered; also when no grievance is occasioned to him or to another; in fine, *when nothing intervenes to render confession odious*.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 238.

Similiter, si ex confessione cognoscat in parochia spargi hæreses, serpere quædam vitia et peccata, poterit per generales instructiones et monitiones, præmunitre fideles contra similia peccata, sic ut personam non prodat.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 238.

In like manner, if he should learn from confession that *heresies are being spread* in his parish, that certain vices and sins are creeping on, he'll be able, by general instructions and monitions, to guard the faithful against such sins, so as not to disclose the person.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 238.

From this it appears that the religion of other people forms a subject of inquiry in the confessional, and that penitents are asked about the faith of their neighbors or their masters. It is to be hoped that this and the extracts from the seventh volume, which follow on the next page, may suggest some precautionary measures to those Protestants who, though married to Roman Catholic wives, would yet bring up their children in the faith of their fathers. Think you, their faith is not tampered with in the confessional? Think you, the priest whispers not into the ear of the fond mother, "My dear, you are bound by no promise to permit the education of your children in a damnable sect?"

An autem conditio educandi prolem in hæresi, v. g. ut filii sequantur patrem hæreticum in sua secta, et filiæ matrem Catholicam, repugnet substantiæ matrimoni.

But is the condition of educating the offspring in heresy repugnant to the substance of matrimony, namely, that the sons may follow their heretical father in his sect, and the daughters their Catholic mother?

R. Observat Daelman, quod si pars Catholica sub tali conditione iniens matrimonium, directe intenderet educationem prolis inhæresi, invalidum foret matrimonium; unde supponitur, inquit, quod duntaxat se obli-

Answer. Daelman observes that, if the Catholic party entering matrimony under such condition directly intended the education of her offspring in heresy, the marriage would be invalid: whence it is supposed, he

get, quod talem educationem non sit impeditura.

Then, after giving the opinions of other Divines, he proceeds:—

Irrita interim est hujusmodi stipulatio, cum repugnet obligationi parentum; et licet aliqui conentur tale pactum excusare, dum pars Catholica tantum se obligat ad permittendum talem educationem ex causa vitandi majoris mali in communitate, ubi Catholici et hæretici permixti vivunt: attamen dicendum cum Pontio, Braunman, et Reiffenstuel, simile matrimonium cum expresso aut tactio pacto, vel sub conditione "ut vel omnes vel aliquæ proles, v. g. masculæ educentur in secta patris hæretici," semper et ubique esse illicitum, iniquissimum et graviter peccaminosum contra naturalem parentum obligationem, ac contra jus divinum et ecclesiasticum: Et enim quivis parentum tenetur ex pietate curare, ut proles in vera fide educatur, mediaque ad salutem necessaria acquirat: ergo non potest pacto se obligare, quo permitteret educationem prolis in secta damnabili.

says, that she only obliges herself not to prevent such education.

In the meantime, this kind of stipulation is null, since it is repugnant to the obligation of parents; and although some endeavor to excuse such compact, while the Catholic party only obliges herself to permit such education for the sake of avoiding greater evil in a community where Catholics and heretics lived mingled together; however, we must say with Pontius, Braunman, and Reiffenstuel, that such marriage with express or tacit compact, or under the condition "that either all, or any, of the children, for instance the males, be educated in the sect of their heretical father," IS ALWAYS and EVERYWHERE UNLAWFUL, most *iniquitous and grievously sinful against the natural obligation of parents and against the divine and ecclesiastical law*; for every parent is bound piously to take care that the offspring be educated in the true faith, and acquire the necessary means

for salvation; therefore *she is bound by no obligation to permit the education of her offspring in a damnable sect.*

Nor do usage and custom, openly existing in several places, make against this; for this compact is against divine law, against which even immemorial custom operates nothing.—*Dens*, v. 7, pp. 144, 5.

Nota quod si Catholicus scienter contrahat matrimonium cum parte hæretica, non possit ex eo capite se ab ea separare, quia renunciat juri divorii; excipe tamen nisi hæreticus conversionem suam promisisset, nec staret promissis; item si Catholicus sciat sibi imminentem periculum amittendæ fidei ex cohabitatione cum hæretica.—Dens, tom. 7, p. 180.

If a Protestant female married to a Roman Catholic renounce not her religion at the bidding of the priest, the marriage is pronounced invalid, and the husband may sue for a divorce. If any immoral rascal should wish to abandon his wife, let him but say that he is in imminent danger of losing his faith by cohabiting with a heretic, and the marriage is dissolved. What think ye of that, Protestants?

Similiter Sanchez existimat in copula fornicaria partis Catholicæ cum hæretica reperire malitiam contra

In like manner, Sanchez is of opinion that when a Catholic commits fornication with a heretic, there is found

religionem; quia quamvis validum sit matrimonium cum parte hæretica, per se tamen est illicitum, et dedecus religionis, item ob periculum perversionis, educationis prolis in hæresi, quæ rationes militant etiam in copula fornicaria.—*Dens*, tom. 7, pp. 196, 7.

in the act a malice against religion; because, although the marriage of a Catholic with a heretic is valid, *it is*, however, *in itself invalid*, and *a disgrace to religion*, as also on account of the danger of perversion, and of educating the offspring in heresy, which reasons militate even in fornicarious copulation.—*Dens*, v. 7, pp. 196, 7.

His holy horror of heresy carries him so far as to pronounce it more sinful to commit fornication with a Protestant girl than with a Roman Catholic. We hope, though we are no advocates for immorality of any kind, that when young Roman Catholics feel their blood too hot they will, for their souls' sake, recollect the distinction.

Quid intelligitur per casus reservatos?

R. Intelliguntur peccata quædam, quorum absolutionem sacramentalem superior specialiter sibi reservat. Hæc reservatio simplex non est censura, cum non est censura, cum non sit proprie poena, sed simplex negatio approbationis vel jurisdictionis.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 263.

Quis potest reservare peccata?

R. Ille Superior, cui competit concedere approbationem vel jurisdictionem ad absolvendum a peccatis.

What is understood by reserved cases?

Answer. Certain sins, the sacramental absolution of which the superior specially reserves to himself.

This simple reservation is not a censure, since it is not properly a punishment, but a simple negation of approbation or jurisdiction.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 263.

Who can reserve sins?

Answer. That Superior for whom it is competent to grant approbation or jurisdiction to absolve from sins.

Summus Pontifex decernit casus reservatos pro universa Ecclesia; Episcopus pro sua Diœcesi; Superiori Regularium pro suis subditus casus reservare possunt, sed juxta limitationem Clementis VIII.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 270.

The Supreme Pontiff determines the reserved cases for the universal Church; the Bishop for his own Diocese; the Superiors of Regulars can reserve cases for their own subjects, but according to the limitation of Clement the 8th.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 270.

DE ABSOLUTIONE COMPLICIS.

ON THE ABSOLUTION OF AN ACCOMPLICE.*

“ Advertendum quod nullus Confessarius, extra mortis periculum, licet alias habeat potestatem absolvendi a reservatis, absolvere possit aut valeat a peccato quolibet mortali externo contra castitatem, complicem in eodem secum peccato.”

“ Let it be observed that, except in case of danger of death, no Confessor, though he may otherwise have the power of absolving from reserved cases, may or can absolve his accomplice in any external† mortal sin against chastity, committed by the accomplice with the Confessor himself.”

He tells us this decree was issued from the illustrious Lord Creusen, Archbishop of the Diocese of Mechlin, and was extended by the Supreme Pontiff, Benedict the Fourteenth, to the whole Church, in the Constitution called *Sacramentum Pœnitentiæ* or *Sacrament of Penance*, on the 1st day of June, 1741. But it must surely be admitted there was some necessity for this decree, or it never would have been made. It necessarily leads to no very favorable opinion of the morality of the Belgian priests. The distemper must have raged furiously, and made great havoc in the fold, before the Archbishop so stigmatized the venerable clergy of his archdiocese. The moral

* *Accomplice.* An accomplice with the priest in the commission of carnal sin.

† *External.* Actual sin, or sin actually committed.

atmosphere must have been strongly infected with sacerdotal miasma before the Archbishop attempted to apply the healing hand to rescue the soft and the tender from the unholy fire with which they were so often smitten. We know enough of the clergy to affirm that the Archbishop would not have been the first to scandalize his reverend brethren. However, this decree is an admission on the part of Dens, who records it of the Archbishop who framed it, and of the Pope himself who extended it to the whole Church, that *women have been seduced in the Confessional*. What was done then may be done now: men and women are still the same, with the same passions and the same desires. But this provides a remedy against the disease. It provides, indeed—what think you?—that the seducer, except in case of danger of death, absolve not his victim, but send her to *any* other priest, who is fully empowered to absolve the fallen creature from her guilt (if, indeed, the guilt be hers), even without the necessity of sending her to his superior for a ticket of absolution. *She has but to change her Confessor.* (Is it ever done?) Such is the remedy!—such the Pontifical specific for the unholy contagion!! Nor is the unholy seducer himself sent to his superior, but in every possible way screened from merited infamy. *He is*, in fact, encouraged in his virtuous career. *Macte virtute puer; sic iter ad astra.* Father John can absolve Father Tom's *chère amie*, and Father Tom can do as much in turn for Father John; and then, at their next meeting, they can both kneel down and alternately absolve each other. Such, and such only, are the extent and power of the check put by an Archbishop and a Pope to the seduction of women in the Confessional. But any one of ordinary sagacity must see that this is rather an encouragement than a check; nay, it is a positive encouragement—it binds them together, and gives them a common interest in the practice. Father Mick must absolve for Father Pat, and Father Pat for Father Mick; and whenever either is so unfortunate as to make an attempt on a refractory penitent, which but seldom happens, as the nature of the confession enables them to select proper victims, they are bound to render one another aid and advice *secretly*, “lest there should arise a suspicion of their having violated the seal;”—“ne suspicio violati sigilli suboriatur.” Each has an interest in protecting the other. But, admitting it to be a check—which I am by no means ready to do—I would ask: Are the

priests of 1892 more virtuous than those of 1741? Are the Irish priests less susceptible than the Belgian? Less alive to the impressions of beauty? Are the women of Ireland less desirable? Are not ease, and idleness, high-keeping, and obscene books (and were ever more obscene books than the cases of conscience?) incentives to lust? Is it not admitted by Dens that the carnal appetites of the Confessor are fired by the bare reading of the cases of conscience, even at home within the cold walls of his study? Put him thus prepared into the Confessional and throw a lovely woman, a weak and lovely one, before him—a woman perhaps addicted to sin—for women do sometimes err—add fire to fire—for it is not the type and paper that fire his imagination and excite his appetites, but the realities they represent to his mind—I now ask any man to imagine himself in the same situation, and honestly tell what is likely to be the result. Are not the “*motus sensitivi*,” the “*motus sensualis*,” the sensitive, sensual, or mulierose motions to which I shall immediately call your attention, as likely to be excited by a bawdy book, a pretty woman, and an opportunity, in an Irishman as a Belgian? O, no! Our priests are spiritual sort of men; they dine daily on ambrosia (not flesh-meat, costly fish, and strong sauces); they quaff nectar (not strong wines, hot punch, or *scaltheen*): and it is but ichor that runs in their veins; they are all spirit, none of your earthly flesh and blood, like other men, and have no carnal desires. Indeed, I believe it. I once heard a very nice girl, and a girl of the better sort, too, say that she would as soon sleep with the priest as with her white petticoat. They are, as Dan said of Father Tom, physically unable; the influence of the Spirit is so great as always to overpower, and, if there be any very rampant, as in Tom's case, sometimes to quite unman them!

Hic casus complicis non collocatur inter casus reservatos, quia Episcopus non reservat sibi absolutionem, sed quilibet alius Confessarius potest ab eo absolvere, praeter quam sacerdos complex.

This case of an accomplice is NOT placed among the reserved cases, because the Bishop does NOT reserve the absolution to himself, but any other Confessor can absolve from it, except the priest who is himself the partner in the act.

Thus you see that the seduction of females in the Confessional does not constitute even a reserved case. But what is reservation? It is not censure, you are told; it is only a simple negation of approbation, or jurisdiction; and thus the Bishops, by not denying approbation, wink at the practice, as long as it can be done without scandal, for that appears to be the only principle of morality they recognize. "Wherefore copulation with a novice, or a nun, or any other bound by a simple vow of chastity, does not constitute a reserved case; nor is a religious man or a priest comprehended (in the reserved case); so that a free woman (qu. lay woman) transgressing with a religious priest does not incur this case (of reservation)." "Proinde copula cum novitia, vel cum Beggina, vel ali voto simplici castitatis obstricta, non constituit casum reservatum: neque vir religiosis aut Sacerdos comprehenditur; adeo, ut persona libera peccans cum Religioso sacerdote non incurrat hunc casum."—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 287.

An comprehenditur masculus complex in peccato venereo v. g. per tactus?

R. Affirmative, quia Pontifex extendit ad qualemunque personam.

Non requiritur ut hoc peccatum complicis patratum sit in confessione, vel occasione confessionis: quocunque enim loco vel tempore factum est, etiam antequam esset Confessarius, facit casum complicis.

Nota ultimo, cum restrictio fiat ad peccata carnis, poterit Confessarius complicem in aliis peccatis, v. g. in furto, homicidio, &c., valide absolvere.—*Dens*, tom. 6, pp. 291, 2.

Is a male accomplice in venereal sin, to wit, by touches, comprehended in this decree?

Answer. Yes; because the Pope extends it to whatsoever person.

It is not required that this sin of an accomplice be committed in confession, or by occasion of confession; for in whatever place or time it has been done, even before he was her Confessor, it makes a case of an accomplice.

Lastly, take note, that since the restriction is made in carnal sins, the Confessor will be able to give valid absolution to his accomplice in other sins, namely, in theft, in homicide, &c.—*Dens*, v. 6, pp. 291, 2.

After telling us that, in obedience to a bull of Gregory XV., and a constitution founded thereon by Benedict XIV., any priest is to be denounced who endeavors to seduce his penitents in the Confessional, he asks the following question:—

Confessarius solicitavit poenitentem ad turpia, non in confessione, nec occasione confessionis, sed ex alia occasione extraordinaria: An est denuntiandus?

A Confessor has seduced his penitent to the commission of carnal sin, not in confession, nor by occasion of confession, but from some other extraordinary occasion. Is he to be denounced?

He tells us in the chapter "De Confessario Solicitante" that by "turpia" are meant carnal or venereal sins, as I have rendered it—"Carnalia seu venerea."—V. 6, p. 294.

R. Negative. Aliud foret, si ex scientia confessionis solicitaret, quia v. g. ex confessione novit illam personam deditam tali peccato venereo.—P. Antoine, t. 4, p. 430.

Answer. No. If he had tampered with her from his knowledge of confession, it would be a different thing, because, for instance, he knows that person, from her confession, to be given to such carnal sins.—P. Antoine, t. 4, p. 430.

Propterea monet Steyartius, quod Confessarius poenitentem, qui confitetur se peccasse cum Sacerdote, vel solicitatum ab eo ad turpia, interrogare possit utrum ille sacerdos sit ejus Confessarius, an in confessione solici-taverit, &c.

An denuntiatio fieri debet, quando dubium est, utrum fuerit vera et sufficiens solici-tatio ad turpia?

For which reason Steyart reminds us that a Confessor can ask a penitent *who confesses that she has sinned with a priest, or has been seduced by him to the commission of carnal sin, whether that priest was her Confessor, or had seduced her in the Confessional.*

Ought the denunciation be made, *when there exists a doubt whether the solicitation to carnal sin was real and sufficient?*

R. Quidam negant, sed Card. Cozza cum aliis, quos citat dub. 25, affirmat, si dubium non sit leve, dicens examen illud relinquendum Episcopo sive Ordinario.—*Dens*, tom. 6, pp. 294, 5.

DE MODO DENUNTIANDI SOLICITANTEM PRÆFATUM.

Primus modus magis conveniens est, si ipsa persona solicitata immediate, nulli alteri revelando, accedat Episcopum sive Ordinarium. 2d. Potest Episcopo scribere epistolam clausam et signatam sub hac forma: *Ego, Catharina N. habitans Mechlinæ in platea N. sub signo N. hisce declaro me 6 Martii anno 1758 occasione confessionis fuisse solicitata ad in honesta a Confessario N. N. excipiente confessiones Mechlinæ, in Ecclesia N. quod juramento confirmare parata sum.*

This date, 1758, informs us of the period at which Dens lived and wrote.

Answer. Some say No; but Cardinal Cozza, with others, whom he cites, doubt 25, says yes, if the doubt be not light; adding that the examination of the matter is to be left to the Bishop or the Ordinary.—*Dens*, v. 6, pp. 294, 5.

ON THE MODE OF DENOUNCING THE AFORESAID SEDUCER.

The first and most convenient mode is this: If the person upon whose chastity the attempt had been made would proceed herself immediately to the Bishop or Ordinary, without revealing the circumstance to any one else. 2d. She can write a letter, closed and sealed, to the Bishop in the following form: *I, Catharine N., dwelling at Mechlin, in the street N., under the sign N., by these declare that I, on the 6th of March, 1758, on the occasion of confession, have been seduced by improper acts by the Confessor N. N., hearing confessions at Mechlin, in the Church N., which I am ready to confirm on oath.*

EXTRACTS FROM DENS' THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

33

3d. Si autem scribere nequeat, similis epistola scribatur ab alio, v. g. a secundo Confessario cum licentia pœnitentis, et nomen pœnitentis seu personæ solicitatæ exprimatur ut supra: sed nomen Confessarii solicitantis, ut occultum maneat scribendi, non exprimatur, verum a tertio aliquo, rei ignaro, in chartula aliqua nomen ejus scribatur sub alio prætextu, quæ chartula epistolæ præfatæ includatur.

Note how all these precautions are taken to secure him from merited infamy.

In hoc casu (denuntiationis) tamen quidam putant moderandum, et considerandas esse circumstantias frequentiæ, periculi, &c.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 295.

The following is taken from no incompetent authority, the Rev. D. O'Croly, Parish Priest of Ovens: “The knowledge of vice is conveyed by indelicate interrogatories; and the profligate priest makes the Confessional subservient to the gratification of his unruly appetites. The crime ‘solicitatio mulieris’—‘to solicit a female in the tribunal’—is not of such rare occurrence.”—*O'Croly's Inquiry*, p. 151.

I remember an attempt to have been made on the virtue of a very pretty young woman, a farmer's wife, at her own house, and in her own room, by a young priest who had been there

3d. But if she cannot write, let a similar letter be written by another, namely, by a second Confessor, with the license of the penitent, and let the name of the penitent or person seduced be expressed as above, but let the name of the seducing Confessor, in order that it may remain a secret to the writer, be not expressed, but let his name be written, under a different pretext, by some third person ignorant of the circumstance, on some scrap of paper, which may be enclosed in the aforesaid letter.

In this case (of denouncing), however, some are of opinion that *moderation* must be observed, and that the circumstances of *frequency*, of *danger*, &c., must be considered.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 295.

hearing confessions. She instantly denounced him to her husband, who drove him out of the house, and on the next day, I believe, laid the matter before the Bishop. How did it end, think you? Terrified, I suppose, (for I know not what the threat or inducement was,) with the threat of sending them both to the Pope, it was then for the first time made known to her neighbors, and *even to her servants*, that she was subject to occasional fits of madness, and that in one of her paroxysms she unfortunately imagined that the priest had made the attempt of which she accused him. The husband was obliged to submit to this imputation on the sanity of his wife's mind and publicly to beg the priest's pardon.

Monentur interea Confessarii, ut mulierculis quibuscumque accusantibus priorem Confessarium, fidem leviter non adhibeant; sed prius scrutentur occasionis finem et causam, examinent eorum mores, conversationem, &c.

Quocirca observa, quod quæcumque persona, quæ per se vel per aliam falso denuntiat sacerdotem tanquam solicitatorem, incurrat casum reservatum Sumno Pontifici. Ita Benedictus XIV. Constitut. *Sacramentum Pœnitentie.* apud Antoine, p. 418.

Benedictus XIV. in Constit. citata numero 216, reservavit sibi et successoribus peccatum falsæ denuntiationis Confessarii sollicitantis ad turpia. — *Dens*, tom. 6, pp. 295-7.

In the meantime Confessors are advised *not lightly to give credit to any women whatsoever* accusing their former Confessor, but first to search diligently into the end and the cause of the occasion, to examine their morals, conversation, &c.

For which reason observe that, whatever person, either by herself or another, falsely denounces a priest as a seducer, incurs a case reserved for the Supreme Pontiff. Thus Benedict XIV., in the Constitution called "*Sacramentum Pœnitentie*," in Antoine, p. 418.

Benedict XIV., in the Constitution cited in No. 216, *reserves to himself and his successors* the sin of falsely denouncing a Confessor for seducing his penitent to commit carnal sins. — *Dens*, vol. 6, pp. 295-7.

Alloquium puellæ est occasio proxima illi qui ex decem vicibus bis vel ter solet cadere in peccatum carnis vel in delectationem carnis deliberatam.

Frequentatio quotidiana tabernæ aut puellæ censetur esse occasio proxima expectu ejus qui ex ea vel bis vel ter in mense prolabitur in simile peccatum mortale.

Idem resolvit P. Du Jardin (p. 51) de administratione quotidiana alicujus officii licet honesti v. g. Medici, Confessarii, Causidici, Mercatoris, si inde quis bis terve per mensem deliberate cadere soleat, et p. 53 concludit Confessarium obligari ad deserendum illud ministerium.

Even according to Du Jardin, who is quoted as being severe, the Confessor may commit carnal sin once in a month with a penitent; for he is not bound to abandon the ministry of hearing her confession unless he falls *twice* or *thrice* within that time.

Obj. Confessarius ille quotidie occupatus in ministerio audiendi confessiones, rarissime cadit comparative ad vices, quibus non cadit; ergo

Speaking to a girl is a proximate occasion (of sin) to him who, out of every ten times, is wont to fall twice or thrice into carnal sin, or into deliberate carnal delight.

Daily frequenting a tavern or a girl is considered a proximate occasion (of sin) in respect to him who, on that account, falls twice or thrice a month into like mortal sin.

P. Du Jardin is of the same opinion (p. 51) respecting the daily administration of any office, however honest—for instance, of a Physician, a Confessor, a Lawyer, a Merchant—if any should on that account be accustomed to fall deliberately two or three times a month; and on page 53 he concludes that the Confessor is bound to desert that ministry.

Objection. That a confessor every day occupied in the ministry of hearing confessions falls very seldom in comparison to the times he

ministerium audiendi confes-
siones respectu, illius non est
occasio proxima.

does not fall; therefore the ministry of hearing confes-
sions is not with respect to
him a proximate occasion (of
sin).

The objector, who puts his argument in favor of the Confessor in as favorable a light as possible, can only say that he falls "very seldom in comparison with the times he does not;" or, in other words, that he seduces but few in comparison with the many he hears; but that he *does* seduce some in the confessional is admitted as a fact, both by the objector and respondent. I confess, after this, I should not like to have a pious wife. There are some, indeed, so often with the priest that one would think them a sort of scapegoat, carrying all the sins of the family on their heads into the wilderness of the Confessional.

R. Neg. cons. quia ille, licet non comparative, absolute tamen frequenter cadit; qui enim per singulos menses committeret duo vel tria injusta homicidia, diceretur absolute frequenter committere homicidium, ille Confessarius toties occidit animam suam.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 175.

Answer. I deny the consequence, because he, though not comparatively, *does*, how-
ever, *absolutely fall frequently*; for he who would commit two or three unjust homicides every month should be said absolutely to commit homicide frequently, so often does that Confessor slay his own soul.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 175.

By consequence he means the inference or conclusion.

DE JUSTIS CAUSIS PERMIT-
TENDI MOTUS SENSUALI-
TATIS.

*Justa causa est auditio
confessionum.*

By "motions" are meant "sensitive motions"—"motus sensitivi," as Dens himself explains it; sharp, tingling sensations of sensual delight shooting through the body, and exciting

ON JUST CAUSES FOR PER-
MITTING MOTIONS OF SEN-
SUALITY.

*Hearing of confessions is
a just cause.*

to corporeal pleasures. Such, you are told, is the state of a Confessor hearing female confessions.

He admits, you perceive, that the carnal appetites of the priests are excited by hearing female confession, and that excitement he justifies. Is there no danger, then, in allowing a lovely woman, whose beauty might move even an angel, to prostrate herself at the feet of a man whose carnal appetites are provoked by his books of conscience—whose frame, fired by her presence, and perhaps, too, in some cases by the burning nature of her details, wriggles upon his seat, throwing open before him the inmost recesses of her heart, and exhibiting to his coarse, vulgar, and inquisitive gaze thoughts and passions she would hide even from her husband, if she be married—from her mother, if she be not? Is there, I ask again, no danger in exposing to an excited man—a mere man, and often of the commonest stamp, *forever debarred from the legitimate possession of such charms*—a lovely creature in all her beauty, and *in all her weakness too*? Did the Confessors not take ad-
vantage of such opportunities they should be something more or less than men; but that they are men, mere men, carnal men, with gross and vulgar passions, we have many and convincing proofs. Not only by sly, insidious questions, but by terror—the terror of denying absolution—("pudorem illum superandum esse, et nolenti denegandem esse absolutionem"—*Maynooth Class Book*, Tract. de Poen., p. 168,)—and what greater terror to a weak and superstitious mind?—the Confessor en-
deavors to overcome the best, the only faithful guardian of female honor,—female modesty. Teach that heaven-stationed sentinel but to slumber on his post, or cease to unfurl his crimson banner on her cheek, and it requires but small pains to scale the walls and take possession of the fortress. Inde-
pendently of the immediate danger, the practice of female con-
fession is abhorrent to every idea of female delicacy and honor. When a woman can sit without a blush, a catechumen in im-
purity, her purity is gone.

Quanta debet esse causa,
ob quam quis se possit habere
permissive ad motus inordi-
natos, sic ut illi motus non
censeantur voluntarii nec
culpabiles?

How great ought to be
the cause for which one can
hold himself permissively
with regard to inordinate
motions, so as that they may
be considered neither volun-
tary nor culpable?

R. Debet esse tanta ut cum suo effectu bono in his circumstantiis prævaleat istis motibus seu effectu malo, juxta regulam N. 15 explicatam.

Hujusmodi justæ causæ sunt auditio confessionum, lectio casum conscientiæ pro Confessario, servitium necessarium vel utile præstitum infirmo.

There is an admission for you! The cases of conscience, drawn up for the use of the Confessor, are of such a nature as to excite the pruriency of his carnal appetites merely by reading them!

Justa causa du cere potest, ut opus aliquod, ex quo motus oriuntur, non tantum licite inchoetur, sed etiam licite continuetur: et ita Confessarius ex auditione confessionis eos percipiens, non ideo ab auditione abstinere debet, sed justam habet perseverandi rationem, modo tamen ipsi motus illi semper displiceant, nec inde oriatur proximum periculum consensus.—*Dens*, tom. 1, pp. 299, 300.

In omni peccato carnali circumstantia conjugii sit exprimenda in confessione.

An aliquando interrogandi

Answer. It ought to be so great as to prevail, with its good effect in these circumstances, over those motions or the bad effect, according to the rule explained in No. 15.

Just causes of this sort are the hearing of confessions, the reading of cases of conscience drawn up for a Confessor, necessary or useful attendance on an invalid.

The cases of conscience, drawn up for the use of the Confessor, are of such a nature as to excite the pruriency of his carnal appetites merely by reading them!

The effect of a just cause is such, that anything, from which motions arise, may not only be lawfully begun, but also lawfully continued; and so the Confessor, receiving those motions from the hearing of confessions, ought not on that account to abstain from hearing them, but has a just cause for persevering, providing, however, that they always displease him, and there arise not therefrom the proximate danger of consent.—*Dens*, v. 1, pp. 299, 300.

In every carnal sin, let the circumstance of marriage be expressed in confession.

Are the married to be at

sunt conjugati in confessione circa negationem debiti?

The following passage is taken from the Moral Theology in which the young priests are lectured in Maynooth; the reader will perceive that it is almost word for word the same with that selected from Peter Dens:—

Quæres 1o. An teneantur conjuges reddere debitum?

R. Teneri utramque conjugem sub mortali injustiæ peccato comparti reddere debitum, dum vel expresse vel tacite exigitur, nisi legitima causa denegandi intervenerit. Id constat ex S. Paulo, 1 Corinth. 7.

Dixi autem 1o, *utramque conjugem teneri*; eo enim pares sunt ambo conjuges, ut patet ex verbis Apostoli.

Dixi 2o, eos teneri *sub peccato mortali*, quia res est per se gravis, cum inde nascantur rixæ, media, dissensiones, parsque debito fraudata incontinentiæ periculo exponatur: quod lethale est. Hinc Parochus, aut per se in Tribunali Pœnitentiæ, aut saltem, et quidem aliquando prudentius piæ matris ministerio, edocare debet sponses et præsertim sponsas, quid in hac parte observandum sit. Cum vero mulieres ejusmodi peccata in confessione sacramentali præ pudore aut ignorantia non

any time asked in confession about denying the marriage duty?

Are man and wife bound to render each other matrimonial duty?

Answer. Each is bound under a *mortal sin* of injustice to render matrimonial duty to his or her partner, while it is expressly or tacitly required, unless there should occur a legitimate reason for refusing. That is manifest from St. Paul, 1 Corinth. chap. 7.

But I have said that each is bound, for in this affair both man and wife are equal, as is clear from the words of the Apostle.

I have said in the second place, that they are bound under *mortal sin*, because it is a weighty affair in itself, since it is the active cause of quarrels, hates, dissensions, and since the party defrauded of duty is exposed to the danger of incontinence, which is a deadly sin. Hence the parish priest, either himself personally in the tribunal of penance (the Confessional), or at least (and sometimes more prudently) by the aid of a pious matron, ought to inform married persons, and *particularly*

raro reticeant expedit aliquando de iis illas interrogare, sed caute et prudenter, non ex abrupto: v. g. inquiri potest an disidia fuerint inter eam et conjugem, quæ eorum causæ, qui effectus, an propere marito denegaverit quod ex conjugii legibus ei debetur.

—*Maynooth Class Book, Tract. de Matrimo.*, p. 482.

married women, of what they should observe with respect to this matter. But since women, through modesty or ignorance, not unfrequently conceal sins of that sort in sacramental confession, it is expedient sometimes to interrogate them regarding those sins, but cautiously, prudently, not abruptly for instance, it may be asked whether there have been any dissensions between her and her husband? What was the cause and what was the effect of them? Whether she has on that account denied to her husband what is due to him by the laws of marriage.

—*Maynooth Class Book, Tract on Matrimony*, p. 482.

Had I intended to seduce another man's wife, I should exactly follow the same prudent course, first cautiously asking whether she and her husband ever fall out, whether he ill-treats or defrauds her, etc., etc. The other questions are of such a character that I could not think of putting them to the vilest creature that ever walked the streets; but, however, as they refer to mortal sin, the married woman must not only listen, but give direct answers, or otherwise be denied the benefit of absolution; "for, if she refuse to answer," says the Maynooth Class Book, "it does not appear that she can be excused from that perverse obstinacy which renders her unworthy of the benefit of absolution." ("Si autem Pœnitens renuat . . . non videtur illam excusari posse a perversa obstinatione, quæ absolutio onis beneficio indignam reddit.")—*Maynooth Class Book, Tract. de Poen.*, p. 169.

R. Affirmative: presertim mulieres, quæ ex ignorantia vel præ pudore peccatum istud quandoque retinent: Verum non ex abrupto, sed prudenter est

Answer. YES; particularly the WOMEN, who, through ignorance or modesty, are sometimes silent on that sin, but the question is not to be put abruptly,

interrogatio instituenda v. g. an cum marito rixatæ sint, quæ hujusmodi rixarum causa; num propter talē occasionem maritis debitum negarint; quod si deliquisse fateantur, caste interrogari debent, an nihil secutum fuerit continentiae conjugali contrarium v. g. pollutio, etc.

but to be framed prudently; for instance, whether they have quarrelled with their husbands; what was the cause of these quarrels; whether they did upon such occasion deny their husbands the marriage duty; but if they acknowledge they have transgressed, they ought to be asked, chastely, WHETHER ANYTHING FOLLOWED CONTRARY TO CONJUGAL CONTINENCE, namely, POLLUTION, etc.

What a question to be put to a man's wife! I would as soon have her hanged as that my wife should submit to such a question from any man that ever lived. If our women were not by nature among the most virtuous in the world, long since their hearts and souls would have been corrupted by such disgusting interrogatories; but God only knows how many soft, confiding ones have been sacrificed to the inordinate lusts of be-priested rustics! In the fourth volume we meet the following passage on female pollution, which, though not immediately referring to the present case, I have been induced to transcribe, in order to show the reader the ideas entertained, and the language employed by priests with respect to females—with respect, it may be, to his mother and his sisters:—

Notatur, quod pollutio in mulieribus quandoque possit perfici, ita ut semen earum non effluat extra membrum genitale; indicum istius allegat Billuart, si scilicet mulier sentiat seminis resolutionem cum magno voluptatis sensu, qua completa passio sentiatur. —*Dens*, tom. 4, p. 380.

It is remarked that women may be guilty of perfect pollution, even without a flow of their semen to the outside of the genital member (the passage), of which Billuart alleges a proof, if, for instance, the woman feel a resolution (loosening) of the semen with a great sense of pleasure, which being completed, her passion is satiated.—*Dens*, v. 4, p. 380.

Hinc uxor se accusans in confessione quod negaverit debitum interrogetur, an maritus ex pleno rigore juris sui id petiverit; idque colligetur ex eo, quod petiverit instanter, quod graviter fuerit offensus, quod aversiones vel alia mala sint secunda, de quibus etiam se accusare debet, quia fuit eorum causa: contra si confiteatur rixas vel aversiones adversus maritum interro-gari potest; an debitum negaverit?—*Dens*, tom. 7, pp. 149, 150.

Hence let the wife, accusing herself in confession of having denied the marriage duty, be asked whether the husband demanded it with the full rigor of his right; and that shall be inferred from his having demanded it instantly, from his having been grievously offended, or from aversions, or any other evils which followed, of which she ought also to accuse herself, because she was the cause of them; on the other hand, if she confess that there exist quarrels and aversions between her and her husband, she can be asked whether she has denied the marriage duty.—*Dens*, v. 7, pp. 149, 150.

If she begin by confessing that she has at any time denied the marriage debt, she is led through the most disgusting interrogatories, under pretence of discovering whether her denial was followed with aversions between her and her husband; but if, on the other hand, she modestly begin by confessing the aversions, she is, notwithstanding, subjected to the same disgusting examination; in no case, therefore, can she escape “*pollution*.”

Variis modis peccari potest contra bonum prolis scilicet 1o, peccant viri, qui committunt peccatum Her et Onam, quos, quia rem hanc detestabilem facerunt, interfecit Dominus. Genesis, 38.

Sin can in various modes be committed against the good of the offspring; 1stly, the men sin who commit the sin of Her and Onan, whom, because they did this detestable thing, the Lord slew. Genesis, 38.

In another passage he informs us of the meaning of the phrase “the good of the offspring”:

Quid est bonum prolis?

R. Legitima prolis genera-tio et ejusdem in veri Dei culta educatio.—*Dens*, tom. 7, p. 146.

2o, peccant uxores, quæ potionibus foetus concep-tionem impediunt, aut sus-ceptum viri semen ejiciunt, vel ejicere conantur.—*Dens*, tom. 7, p. 147.

Notent hic Confessarii, quod conjugati, ne proles nimium multiplicentur, ali-quando committunt detesta-bile turpitudinem, in similitudinem Her et Onam, circa quod peccatum examinandi sunt.—*Dens*, tom. 7, p. 153.

Ne Confessarius hæreat iners in circumstantiis ali-cujus peccati indigandis in promptu habeat hunc circum-stantiarum versiculum:

Quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 123.

By the word “*Quis*,” we are told (vol. i. p. 257), it is meant that the priest should know the quality or condition of the penitent; whether maid, wife, or widow, etc.

By “*quid*,” the quantity, quality, and effect of the act.

By “*ubi*,” the accidental quality of the place, whether sacred

What does “the good of the offspring” mean?

Answer. It means the legiti-mate generation of offspring, and the education of the same in the worship of the true God.—*Dens*, v. 7, p. 146.

2dly, the wives sin who prevent the conception of the foetus with potions, or *eject*, or *endeavor to eject*, the seed received from the man.—*Dens*, v. 7, p. 147.

Here let the confessors take note that the married, lest their children should multiply too fast, sometimes commit a detestable turpi-tude, like that of Her and Onan, *about which sin THEY ARE TO BE EXAMINED*.—*Dens*, v. 7, p. 153.

Lest the confessor should indolently hesitate in tracing out the circumstances of any sin, let him have the follow-ing versicle of circumstances in readiness:

Quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 123.

or profane, public or private; and here Dens takes occasion to say that carnal sins, as fornication, etc., committed in the conversation-room or garden of a monastery, should not on that account be considered sacrilegious, from which it appears that in religious communities or societies the conversation-room and garden enjoy certain immunities or privileges. (*Si præfata peccata commitorentur in locutorio aut horto monasterii non inde contraherent malitiam sacrilegii.*)

By "quibus auxiliis," the non-essential or accidental instruments and means, the *partners* or *accomplices*.

By "quomodo," the accidental mode of an action, which conduces to the goodness or badness of the action, the "modus quo actio posita est," or manner in which the action has taken place.

By "quando," the quality and quantity, or duration of time.

By "cur," the "finis operantis," the end proposed by the operator; the "propter quid," the why or wherefore.

The above circumstances are then summed up, and exemplified in the following chaste and edifying corollary; "John, the keeper of the Church, long intending to commit fornication with Anna, having called in his accomplices, violently snatches from the hands of the priests in the Church the consecrated chalice of gold, in order that he may have money to commit the fornication with her, in consequence of which the people were not able to hear Mass on the holy day: tell how many and what circumstances intervene in this case?"

An Confessarius potest absolvere sponsam dum cognoscit ex sola confessione sponsi, quod sponsa in confessione reticeat fornicationem habitam cum sponso?

Can a Confessor absolve a young woman going to be married, while he knows, solely from the confession of the betrothed husband, that she does not disclose, in her confession, the fornication she has been guilty of with her betrothed?

Answer. I find various opinions: La Croix thinks that she ought not to be absolved, but that the Confessor should *dissemble*, and

R. Varias reperio opiniones: La Croix, lib. 6, p. n. 1969, existimat sponsam non esse absolvendam, sed dissimulantur dicendum:

Miseriatur tui, &c., ita ut ipsa ignoret sibi absolutionem negari.

Miseriatur tui, "The Lord have mercy on you," instead of "absolve, &c.," I absolve you, &c.

Prudentes Confessarii solent et statuunt regulariter inquirere ab omnibus sponsis, utrum occasione futuri matrimonii occurserint cogitationes quædam in honestæ? Utrum permiserint oscula, et alias majores libritates ad invicem ex eo, quod forte putaverint jam sibi plura licere?

Cum verecundia soleat magis corripere sponsam, propterea solemus prius in confessione audire sponsum, ut sponsa postea confidentius exponat, quod novit jam esse notum Confessario.

Addunt aliqui, sponsum, qui prius confitetur, posse induci, ut dicat sponsæ, se peccatum illud aperte esse confessum. Post confessionem sponsæ id non licet amplius.—*Dens*, tom. 6, pp. 239, 240.

say, *Miseriatur tui, &c.*, so that she may not know that absolution has been denied her.

Prudent Confessors are *wont, and lay it down regularly, to ask from all young women going to be married*, whether from occasion of their approaching marriage there occurred to them any improper thoughts? Whether they permitted kisses, and other greater alternate liberties, because, perhaps, they thought that greater freedom would soon be allowed them?

And since the young woman is more under the influence of modesty, *we are wont for that reason to hear the betrothed husband's confession first, that she may afterwards more confidently reveal to the Confessor what she knows to be now known to him.*

Some divines add that the betrothed husband, who makes his confession first, can be induced to tell her that he has openly confessed that sin. After the young woman's confession, that would be no longer in the Confessor's power.—*Dens*, v. 6, pp. 239, 240.

Why all this ingenuity to extract the confession of this act from her? It is or it is not necessary to a complete and valid confession. If it be necessary, and if the omission, the voluntary or involuntary omission, of any mortal sin, as we are told in vol. vi. p. 103, renders the confession sacrilegious, and puts the penitent under the necessity of renewing her confession ("proinde sacrilega est et interanda"), it follows that married women are subjected to a most disgusting and polluting examination on the circumstances of the conjugal act; but if they are not examined on those circumstances, and if the voluntary or involuntary omission of a mortal sin (for in the conjugal act there are four modes and some motives said to be mortal) does not render the confession of a married woman sacrilegious, why is all this ingenuity employed in confessing a young creature on the eve of her marriage? Why is she not left to herself? Why is it a *rule* with confessors to hear her betrothed's confession first, lest the commission of the act may by any possibility escape the knowledge of his reverence? Can his motives be exempt from suspicion? If a married woman, as some would persuade us, can omit perhaps three or four mortal sins without incurring the guilt of sacrilege or invalidating her confession, why may not this young woman, through ignorance or modesty, omit one? Or, if the omission of this one, through ignorance or modesty, invalidates her confession, how can a married woman be permitted to omit perhaps four? Utrum horum mavis accipe. I leave you to your choice.

An licita est delectatio morosa de opere jure naturae prohibito, sed sine culpa formalis hic et nunc posito, v. g. delectatio de pollutione nocturna involuntaria?

R. Neg. quia objectum delectationis est intrinsecus malum, adeoque deliberata delectatio de ea est mala.

Is morose delight allowed on a thing prohibited by the law of nature, but here and now (i. e. in the supposed case) having taken place without a formal fault, for instance, delight on nocturnal involuntary pollution?

Answer. No; because the object of the delight is intrinsically bad, and therefore deliberate delight respecting it is also bad.

Multi tamen, ut Salmanticenses, Vasquez, Billuart, Antoine, &c., putant quod licet illicitum sit delectari de homicidio, ebrietate, &c., involuntarie commissis, illicitum tamen non sit, ob finem bonum de pollutione mere naturali et involuntaria delectari; vel affectu simplici et ineffaci eam desiderare.

Hujus sententiae etiam est S. Antonius parte 2, tit. 6, cap. 5.

St. Anthony. There is an old beast of a saint for you, longing for nocturnal pollution.

Dicitur "affectu simplici et ineffaci;" quia, si desideretur efficaciter, ita ut ex desiderio pollutio causetur, vel media ut eveniat adhibeantur, certum est juxta omnes quod sit peccatum mortale. Ratio horum authorum est, quod pollutio mere naturalis et involuntaria nullo jure prohibeatur: cum sit effectus mere naturalis, seu mera naturae evacuatio, ut sudor, saliva, &c., ac proinde nequidem materialiter seu objective mala, unde illam ut talem ineffaciter velle non est peccatum. —Dens, tom. 1, pp. 310, 311.

Many, however, as Salmanticenses, Vasquez, Billuart, Antoine, &c., think that although it is unlawful to delight on homicide, drunkenness, &c., involuntarily committed, it is not unlawful, however, on account of the good end, to delight on merely natural and involuntary pollution, or to desire it with a simple and ineffacious affection.

Of this opinion is also Saint Anthony, part 2, tit. 6, chap. 5.

They say "with a simple and an ineffacious affection," because if it be desired efficaciously, so as that the pollution be caused by the desire, or means employed that it may happen, it is certain according to all that it is a mortal sin. The reason of these authors is, that pollution merely natural and involuntary is prohibited by no law; since it is a merely natural effect, or a mere evacuation of nature, like sweat, saliva, &c., and therefore it is by no means materially or objectively bad; whence it is not a sin to wish for an ineffa-

Quid est morosa delectatio?

R. Est voluntaria complacentia circa objectum illicitum absque voluntate implendi seu exequendi opus.

Vocatur "morosa" non a mora temporis, quo durat; nam unico instanti perfici potest; sed a mora rationis, quæ delectationem hanc, postquam eam advertit, repellere negligit; et sic ratio est in mora fungendi suo procedendi ad ipsum opus.

In qua materia hæc delectatio locum habet?

R. Quamvis delectatio morosa frequentius contingat circa venerea, locum tamen habere potest in quacumque materia, ut circa furtum, pugnam, vindictam, &c.—*Dens*, tom. 1, p. 303.

An persona conjugata peccat delectando venereè de copula vel tactibus cum comparte habitis aut habendis, si compars sit absens

caciously as such.—*Dens*, v. 1, pp. 310, 311.

What is "morose delight?"

Answer. It is a voluntary complacence about an illicit object, without a wish of performing or executing the work.

It is called "morose" not from the delay (mora) of time during which it lasts, for it may be complete in an instant, but from the delay of reason, which neglects to repel this delight, after it has perceived it; and thus reason delays in discharging its own office. It can also be called "morose," because reason dwells on it without a wish of proceeding to the work itself.

In what manner does this delight take place?

Answer. Although morose delight more frequently happens about venereous matters, however, it can take place in any matter whatsoever, as about theft, about fighting, about revenge, &c.—*Dens*, v. 1, p. 303.

Does a married person sin in delighting venereously on copulation or on touches, which she has had or is to have, if at any time of the

tempore delectationis, infirma, &c., adeo ut copula hic et nunc sit impossibilis?

Married person, male or female, as the case may be.

R. Si delectando se exponat periculo pollutionis, certo peccat mortaliter, contra castitatem, et etiam contra justitiam. Si vero absit periculum pollutionis, Sanchez, Sylvius, Steyart, et Daelman eam a mortali liberant, quia honestas status matrimonialis videtur talem delectationem a mortali excusare. Alii tamen probabilius similem delectationem censem mortalem, ut Navarrus, Billuart, Collet, Antione, &c.—*Dens*, tom. 1, p. 315.

And consequently must be told in confession.

Ad quispiam voto castitatis obstrictus facit contra suum votum, si aliis personis liberis sit causa libidinis, v. g. si consulat aliis, ut illi inter se fornicentur?

R. Peccat peccato scandali et fit reus fornicationis illorum; verum tamen non videtur violare votum proprium mere ob fornicationem

delight her partner be absent or infirm, &c., so as that copulation be here and now impossible?

Answer. If in delighting she expose herself to the danger of pollution, she certainly sins mortally against chastity, and also against justice. But if there be no danger of pollution, Sanchez, Sylvius, Steyart, and Daelman free her from mortal sin, because the honesty of the matrimonial state seems to excuse such delight from mortal sin. Others, however, as Navarrus, Billuart, Collet, and Antione, &c., think with much more probability that such delight is a mortal sin.—*Dens*, v. 1, p. 315.

Does any one bound by a vow of chastity act against his vow, if he be the cause of lechery to others, who are free from such vow; for instance, if he advises others to commit fornication with one another?

Answer. He is guilty of the sin of scandal, and stands arraigned of their fornication; however, he does not seem to violate his

aliorum, si absit complacencia propria, quia non vovit, servare castitatem alienam, sed propriam, sicuti conjugatus id consulens non peccat contra fidem matrimonii sui.

own vow merely on account of the fornication of others, if he feel no complacency himself; *because he has made no vow to preserve the chastity of others*, but his own, just as a married man advising it does not sin against the faith of his matrimony.

If his mind dwell not with delight upon the pleasure accompanying the act, for that is the meaning of “*si absit complacencia propria*.” This reminds me of the reasoning of an old procuress, incapacitated by age from participating herself in sexual pleasures, having been introduced to a young gentleman who felt a strong desire to increase and multiply, she faithfully executed her commission; but being subjected for her conduct to the reproaches of her neighbors, she very caustically replied, “*Yeigh, what did I do? Sure 'tisn't me he has; IT IS A LONG TIME SINCE I THOUGHT OF SICH A THING.* Yarra, the crathurs are young; wisha, what harm is it to bring them together, and make them happy?” Would you not think she took a lesson from Peter Dens? She felt no complacency herself, but she brought the young people together and advised them to commit fornication.

According to this doctrine, a mother abbess (if she could but avoid scandal) may keep a brothel, and monks and nuns be the procurers; and indeed, it has been told me by a gentleman, on whose veracity I CAN depend, that when he served in Spain under the Duke of Wellington, the monks and friars were ever ready to *offer* their services in this way; he knew one of them to have *proposed* the thing to his own son, who served in the same regiment with him, and a little before the appointed time, he came into the officer’s cell (the military were quartered in the monasteries) to ask whether it was a girl or a boy that he wished him to bring to him. Perhaps the above passage from Dens may serve as an answer to the Duke of Norfolk, who, in the debate on Irish education (*Evening Mail*, 15th February), “wished to know from the Bishop of Exeter if he thought the morals of the Gospel were not propounded and inculcated as well by monks and Roman Catholic priests as by those of Protestant persuasion?” or, perhaps his grace could name some

book undertaken and published with the authority of Protestant Bishops, as a guide for their clergy, which teaches that not only they, but persons bound by vows of chastity, may become pimps or panders, and advise others to commit fornication.

A Swiss officer, a man of the world, but of undoubted veracity, relates that he served in Napoleon’s army during its occupation of Italy, and that it was then and there a common thing for the priests and monks to feast the officers at their convents, and after they had sufficiently indulged in the viands and wine provided for them, to finish off their entertainment by furnishing their military guests with priestly garments, and in that disguise introduce them to as many women as they had occasion for. The women, supposing their gallants to be foreign priests, of course were obedient and conformable.

Obj. Vovens castitatem vovet non cooperati aut consentire ulli peccato contra castitatem.

R. Id. negatur.—*Dens*, tom. 4, p. 337.

Obj. He that makes a vow of chastity vows not to co-operate with, or consent to, any sin against chastity.

Answer. IT IS DENIED.—*Dens*, v. 4, p. 337.

The impersonal gives this denial a peculiar force. It isn’t I deny it, or St. Thomas, or any other saint denies it; but, IT IS DENIED, sc. ab omnibus, IT IS DENIED BY THE CHURCH. Here, then, you perceive, if it can be done without scandal, priests and friars, monks and nuns, are taught that they may consent to co-operate with, and advise others to commit fornication. In reading the “*Complete Theology*,” it appears that even this has been done in the confessional.

Quantum est peccatum exercere actum conjugalem ob solam voluptatem?

R. Cum S. Aug. et S. Thom. Suppl. q. 49, a. 6, in corp. esse solummodo ex natura suâ veniale; quia hæretur, ut supponitur, intra limites legitimi matrimonii; potest tamen esse mortale ratione finis, vel aliarum

How great is the sin to exercise the conjugal act solely for pleasure?

I answer with St. Augustine and St. Thomas (Suppl. 49, etc.), that it is only venial in its own nature, because it is fixed, as is supposed, within the limits of legitimate matrimony; however, it may be a mortal

circumstantiarum: puta si v. g. vir ita voluptate captus sit, ut accedens ad uxorem, paratus sit ad eam accedere, licet uxor non foret, vel si tempore actus conjugalis affectum et delectationem habeat erga aliam, cuius etiam qualitates tunc erunt in confessione experimendæ, puta quod sit conjugata consanguinæ, &c., idque præcipue est cavendum in bigamis, ne dum copulatur conjugi secundæ, affectum, ponat in priori.

sin by reason of the end, or other circumstances; suppose, for instance, if the man were so seized with pleasure that, going to his wife, he were ready to do to her though she were not his wife; or if, at the time of the conjugal act, he have his affections and delights towards another, whose qualities also (i. e., as well as the foregoing circumstances) shall then (in that case) be expresssed in confession, suppose that she is married, that she is his blood relation, etc., and this is particularly to be guarded against in those who are married a second time, lest while he is copulating with his second wife, he may fix his affections on the first.

What is written in the above extract equally applies to the wife. Not being Turks, but Christians, we admit that she has equally a soul to be saved. That which is an innocent or legitimate act in its own nature, may become in her case, too, "a mortal sin by reason of the end or circumstances;" for instance, if the wife, waiting the approach of her husband, be so overpowered with delight or anticipated pleasure as to be ready to admit him, at that critical juncture, even if he were not her husband; or if, during the act, she dwelt with delight on some handsome young fellow she has danced or played with, or has heard making a speech, it may be at the arena, or if she should sacrilegiously fix her delight on even her confessor himself, and wish him, even if it were but once, a layman; or if, supposing her married a second time, she recall the memory of her former husband, compare their respective

merits, decide that he was the better man, heave a long-drawn sigh, and fix her delight accordingly on him. Now, as these circumstances are mortal sins, and as the voluntary or involuntary omission of any one of them, whether from ignorance ("ex ignorantia") or forgetfulness ("oblivione"), or error ("vel errore"), is a mortal sin in the very receiving of the sacrament ("in ipsa susceptione sacramenti," *Dens*, tom. 6, p. 103), and as "women, from ignorance or modesty, not unfrequently omit such sins" ("præ pudore aut ignorantia non raro reticeant," *Maynooth Class Book*, Tract. de Matrim., p. 483), the Confessor will do his duty (si ulterioribus interrogationibus detur locus, ministerium suum implebit Confessarius, *Class Book*, De Prœ. Decal., p. 229)—will, of course, put his questions, and, despite all her modesty, save her soul alive.

The Maynooth Class Book likewise (Tractate on Matrimony, p. 480) says, that if the exercise of the conjugal act be so immoderate as to injure ("si immoderata sic ac noceat") the health of either party ("valetudini sive exigentis debitum sive redditus"), it is a *deadly sin* ("lethalis est"). Therefore, as such, it necessarily becomes a subject of confession, the voluntary or involuntary omission of which would render the confession sacrilegious. Delicate subject of examination, surely, for a newly married woman, whose husband's or whose own cheeks, perhaps, have become pale at the end of the honeymoon! Or, if it be so frequent as to interfere with the time of praying ("si ita frequens sit ut impedit tempora quæ debentur orationi"); or if, according to St. Thomas, who appears to be a great connoisseur in such matters, either of the parties fix his or her intention upon any but his or her immediate partner in the act. ("Si conjux aliam non conjugem intendit.")

Ad liceat actum conjugalem exercere partim ob debitum finem, puta generationem prolis, et partim ob delectationem?

R. Negative; quia tunc finis equidem partialiter est inordinatus, cum ex parte obediatur libidini, sicque partialiter invertitur ordo a

Is it lawful to exercise the conjugal act partly for the due end, namely, the generation of offspring, and partly for delight?

Answer. No; because then, indeed, the end is partially inordinate, since in part obedience is given to lust, and thus the order ap-

Deo et natura constitutus.—
Dens, tom. 7, p. 163.

An licitum est petere debitum conjugale ex solo fine vitandi propriam incontinentiam, non concurrente fine generationis prolii, vel redditionis debiti?

R. Pontius cum multis aliis affirmat, sed melius cum SS. Augustino et Thoma videtur negandum.—*Dens*, tom. 7, p. 164.

Conjugatis proponi potest: an pacifice vivant; An honesto modo utantur matrimonio? An periculo pollutionis sese exposuerint? An proles Christiane edacent?

Circa quæ specialiter examinari possunt adolescentes ætatis circiter viginti annorum, satis vegeti et munpani. vel potui dediti?

R. Circa peccata luxuræ primo per generales interrogaciones et a longinquo: v. g. an poenitens frequentet personas alterius sexus? Si concedat; an sint dicta quædam verba honesta?

pointed by God and by nature is partially inverted.—*Dens*, v. 7, p. 163.

Is it lawful to ask conjugal duty solely with the end or view of avoiding incontinence in one's self, and without the concurring end of generating offspring or of rendering duty?

Answer. Pontius and many others say YES; but it seems better to say NO, with St. Augustine and St. Thomas.—*Dens*, v. 7, p. 164.

To the married it can be proposed, whether they live peaceably? Whether they enjoy matrimony in an honest way? Whether they have exposed themselves to the danger of *pollution*? Whether they bring up their children like Christians?

About what can young men be specially examined at the age of about twenty years, sufficiently vigorous, and like many men of the world, or given to drink?

Answer. About the sins of luxury, first by general questions and from afar; for example, whether the penitent frequents persons of the other sex? If he allows that he does, whether any improper words were said?

Quid secutum? &c. Si neget, potest inquiri: An aliquando vexetur in honestis cogitationibus vel somniis? Si affirmet, ad interrogaciones ulteriores progredi oportet.

Eadem prudentiæ forma observabitur circa adolescentulam vel mulierem vane comptam.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 125.

Here, then, we are told what sort of examination young girls and fine ladies undergo in the Confessional: they are examined on the sins of luxury. But what are those sins? What is luxury, or how is it defined? In the first volume, p. 350, luxury is defined as “*an inordinate appetite for venereal pleasures*” (Quid est luxuria? *R.* Est inordinatus appetitus venereorum); and thus we are informed, on unquestionable authority, that young girls and fine ladies are interrogated on their inordinate appetite for venereal pleasures. Well, but what are the sins which come under this head, or how is this luxury divided? In the fourth volume, p. 360, we find it divided into seven species: 1st, Simple Fornication; 2d, Stupratiōn, which he defines (p. 370) to be “*the deflouring of a virgin—a pure virgin, who never lost the seal of her virginity by carnal copulation, or any other equivalent unchaste act*” (quæ signaculum virginale non amisit per carnalem copulam, vel forte per alios aequivalentes impudicos actus); 3d, Rape; 4th, Adultery; 5th, Incest; 6th, Sacrilege; 7th, Vice against nature. Well, then, after having ascertained that the penitent is a young girl or fine lady, which is in the present case supposed, she is then asked whether she frequents or associates with young men? Whether any immodest words were spoken, or indelicate songs were sung by her? What followed? But, if this young girl or fine lady has unfortunately made a slip, as young girls and fine ladies sometimes do, the Confessor is prepared for the attack with his versicle or hexameter of circumstances, of which only two have as yet been brought into requi-

What followed? &c. If he answer in the negative, it can be asked, whether he is at any time tormented with improper thoughts or dreams? If he say Yes, it is fit to proceed to further questions.

The same form of prudence shall be observed about a *young girl*, or a *woman vainly decked*.—*Dens*, v. 6, p. 125.

sition. The “quis” and “quid,”—Who and What,—are the two answered. Then comes the “ubi,” or Where? At home or abroad? In the house, or in the open air? He next calls up the “quibus auxiliis” to his aid. With what accomplices? What means? What aids? Then the “cur,”—Why or Wherefore? And then the “QUOMODO,” a word of more importance in the Confessional than all the rest put together, for now, indeed, the young Confessor has a great and splendid opportunity of displaying his *wonderful* proficiency in MORAL THEOLOGY! Oh, he has her at last, on the fifth species of luxury against nature, “which is committed when the connection takes place standing, sitting, or from behind, as horses do it (sicut equi congreguntur, v. 4, p. 350), or when the man lies undermost,” and consequently the woman lies uppermost; and as attitude is everything, even in this, she is put through a very interesting examination on the five positions; for, in the Confessional as in the dancing-school, she has to go through her positions, of which, however, she is told, on the authority of Peter Dens (and what better authority?), the preference is to be given to the first, as being the easiest and most natural, and consequently the most graceful. But, as Patrick Woods, Presbyter, says in the directory, “Dominum Dens auctorem sequentes discutiemus,” “following the authority of Mr. Dens,” who appears from the internal evidence of his book to have understood the nature and efficacy of the positions, as well practically as theoretically, “we shall here discuss or arrange” the five positions according to their order. The first and natural position is, that the woman lie underneath the man, “ut mulier succumbat viro;” the second, when they come to it on their sides, “a latere;” the third, to take her from behind, “a retro;” the fourth, sitting or standing, “stando vel sedendo;” the fifth, that the man lie underneath, “ut vir sit succubus.” What a word! Having taken the poor creature, perhaps, through all the positions (for through modesty or ignorance she will wait of course to be asked), in order to discover the “quomodo,” the mode or manner, of her offence, without a full disclosure of which, according to the *Maynooth Class Book*, “her confession would be sacrilegious and unworthy of absolution,” the whole is wound up with a “quando”—a When? or How long? which, though not affording an opportunity for many *theological interrogatories*, may nevertheless afford his reverence a favorable opportunity for some very interesting

practice. But, if the girl has not as yet made a slip, and is ignorant of all the positions, except only so far as instinct informs her, which, if I mistake not, will never take her beyond the first position, she is then examined about her thoughts and dreams; and a very queer girl indeed she should be if, in the heyday of youth and beauty, in all the gayety of an innocent but laughing heart, had she not now and then some merry thoughts and pleasant dreams: if to this last question she say Yes, as indeed she must, she is then interrogated by some young priest—who in the confessional luxuriates in his newly acquired privilege of addressing respectable females—whether she has had any carnal commotions (“circa partes pudendas”), and whether she has indulged them? But, as those desires, or commotions if you will, form part of her nature, and were given her for wise purposes by HIM who understood his own great designs much better than Dens, or the Pope, or the Councils, she must say Yes to this question, too. Now then the Confessor has an opportunity of throwing in a very interesting question, from which no bashfulness can save her; for, according to the *Maynooth Class Book*, “HER MODESTY MUST BE OVERCOME” (Pudor ille vincendens), and she must learn not only to hear, but answer, the most shameful interrogatories without even a blush, since “her confession were sacrilegious if cut short from so vain a motive” (sacrilega foret confessio quæ ex tam vano motivo decurtaretur, *Maynooth Class Book*, Tract. de Pœn., p. 164). He gets her at last, then, on excitement by touches, and asks whether she has “destroyed the material integrity of her virginity by a violent penetration of the passage with her finger, or any other instrument;” for, according to Dens (v. 4, p. 363), there are three ways of losing virginity: first, by carnal copulation, “per carnalem copulam;” second, by a libidinous resolution of the seminal fluid, “per libidinosam resolutionem seminis;” third, by a violent penetration of the passage with her finger, or any other instrument, “per violentam penetrationem vasis digito aut alio instrumento.” From the same chapter it appears that those pure ladies, the nuns, must answer like questions before they can receive the veil of profession or consecration from the hands of the bishop; “sic corruptæ possunt accipere velum professionis, sed non velum consecrationis ab Episcopo.” And thus it appears that even the *meekest* of our bishops must put such questions to females, and receive direct or positive answers

before he can give the veil of profession or consecration. If we believe that the priest cannot reveal the sins he has heard in confession, the bishop cannot discharge his duty in this respect by proxy; although, perhaps, he may employ his chaplain to put the interrogatories, or to take a microscopic view, and, with the consent of the ladies, to pass on the result of his observations, "with and under the seal," to the ears of his lordship. As girls who have lost their material virginity, by natural or artificial means, cannot receive the veil of consecration from the hands of the bishop, the aspirant to that high honor, to that demi-canonization, must answer some delicate questions, or perhaps submit to a more delicate examination, before her pretensions to consecration can be fully determined. I believe our nuns are all professed.

DE PECCATIS CARNALIBUS ON THE CARNAL SINS WHICH CONJUGUM INTER SE. MAN, AND WIFE COMMIT WITH ONE ANOTHER.

Certum est, conjuges inter se peccare posse, etiam graviter contra virtutem castitatis, sive continentiae, ratione quarandam circumstantiarum; in particulari autem definire, quae sunt mortales, quae solum veniales, per obscurum est, nec eadem omnium sententia; ut vel ideo sollicite persuadendum sit conjugatis, ut recordentur se esse filios Sanctorum, quos decet in sanctitate conjugali filios procreare. Quidam authores circumstantias circa actum conjugalem praeципue observandas, exprimunt his versibus:

It is certain that man and wife can sin grievously against the virtue of chastity or continence, with regard to certain circumstances relating to the use of their bodies; but to define particularly what are mortal, what only venial, is a matter of very great difficulty, nor are all writers of one opinion on the subject; so that, even on that account, the married ought to be anxiously advised to recollect that they are the children of the saints, and should therefore beget children in conjugal sanctity. The circumstances which are chiefly to be observed in the per-

EXTRACTS FROM DENS' THEOLOGICAL WORKS.

"Sit modus, et finis, sine damno, solve cohære.
Sit locus et tempus, tactus,
nec spernito votum."

formance of the conjugal act some authors express in the following verses:—

Let the posture be such as best suits the great end
For which nature ordains
that the sexes shall blend.
The debt duly pay when
your vigor's excited,
By

The time, too, deserves some trifling attention;
But of fluor and of births
I've already made mention,
Without loss to the parties
engaged in the task,
To the husband or wife, or
the babe in the cask.
When bound by a vow, to
the act don't entice,
But, if tempted to yield, fall
to work in a trice.

The interpretation of "nec spernito votum" is taken from Dens himself, who thus explains his meaning: "Habens tale votum (sc. castitatis), non potest petere debitum. Tenetur reddere debitum petenti"—v. 7, p. 155, which is exactly the same as in the translation. To the English reader it is necessary to state that, although there are only two lines in the Latin, and twelve in the English, there is not an idea in the one that is not in the other.

Ergo debet servari modus,
sive situs, qui dupliciter in-

Therefore, method or pos-
ture ought to be observed,

vertitur 1o, ut non servetur debitum vas, sed copula habeatur in vase præpostero, vel quocumque alio non naturali; quod semper mortale est spectans ad sodomiam minorem, seu imperfectam, idue tenendum, contra quosdam laxistas sive copula ibi consummetur, sive tantum inchoetur consummata in vase naturali.

which is inverted in a two-fold way: 1st, when the proper passage or vessel is not kept, but the connection takes place in the hinder passage or vessel, or in any other not ordained by nature for that purpose, which is always a mortal sin, tending to that which is called minor or imperfect sodomy, and this must be held against certain divines of loose opinions, whether the connection be consummated there (in the improper passage), or be only begun there, to be consummated in the natural passage.

In the fourth volume he divides sodomy into two species—perfect and imperfect, or minor.

Quid est sodomia perfecta?

R. Est congressus carnalis inter personas ejusdem sexus, nimirum masculi cum masculo, feminæ cum femina, in quocunque vase congressus fiat.

Sodomia imperfecta sive sodomia minor est congressus carnalis maris cum femina, sed extra vas femineum naturale, v. g. si vir effundat semen suum retro per anum in intestinum stercoreum feminæ.—*Dens*, tom. 4, p. 379.

“Chapeauville, Braunman, P. Pau, and other divines exclude from reservation minor sodomy, or that which is com-

mitted between persons of different sex,—for instance, when a man has connection with his wife in the hinder vessel,—because, according to St. Thomas, it is not sodomy, strictly and properly so called.” What nice distinctions! what splitting of hairs! But on this subject we will have a little more of St. Thomas's morality by and by. “Chapeauville, Braunman, P. Pau aliique excludunt a reservatione sodomiam minorem, quæ scilicet committitur inter personas diversi sexus, quâ v. g. vir congreditur, cum uxore in vase præpostero; quia, juxta S. Thomam, non est sodomia stricte et proprie dicta.”—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 285. Here we have an opportunity of forming some estimate of the morality of the Church of Rome, and her saints and her doctors: if a man commit sodomy with his wife or any other woman, it does not constitute a reserved case, on the high authority of St. Thomas and other doctors; on the authority of St. Thomas, a saint now in heaven—one of those holy ones to whom the people are taught to address their prayers. But, if a man “knowingly read or retain, imprint, or carry about, in any way whatsoever, books containing the heresy of heretics and apostates, or treating of religion, he is *excommunicated with an excommunication reserved to the Supreme Pontiff*.” Scinter legentes, aut retinentes, imprimentes, seu quomodo libet deferentes libros Hæreticorum et Apostatarum hæresim continentes, vel de Religione tractantes excommunicantur excommunicatione Pontifici reservata.—*Dens*, tom. 6, p. 307.

The wretched word “laxistæ” does not occur in any dictionary that I have met; however, I think I have given its meaning.

Modus sive situs invertitur, ut servetur debitum vas ad copulam a natura ordinatum, v. g. si fiat accedendo a præpostere, a latere, stando, sedendo, vel si vir sit succumbens. Modus is mortalis est, si inde suboriantur, periculum pollutionis respectu alterius, sive quando periculum est, ne semen perdat, prout sæpe accidit, dum actus exercetur

Method or posture is inverted, though the connection take place in the passage or vessel appointed by nature for that purpose; for instance, if it be done by an attack from behind, or when the parties are on their sides, or standing or sitting, or when the husband lies underneath his wife. This method of doing it is a mortal sin, if there should there-

stando, sedendo, aut viro succumbente: si absit et sufficientur præcaveatur istud periculum, ex communis sententia id non est mortale: est autem veniale ex gravioribus, cum sit inversio ordinis naturæ; est quæ generatim modus ille sine causa taliter cœundi graviter a Confessariis reprehendens: si tamen ob justam rationem situm naturalem conjuges immutent, secludaturque dictum periculum nullum est peccatum, ut dictum est in numero 48.

from arise to either party a danger of pollution or of losing the seed, a thing which *often happens* when the act is performed

if that danger be sufficiently guarded against, it is not, in the common opinion of the divines, a mortal sin; yet it is one of the weightier sort of venial sins, since it is an inversion of the order of nature, and, in general, that method of thus coming to coition *must, when without sufficient cause, be severely censured by the Confessors*. If, however, man and wife, for some just reason, change

there will be no sin, as has been said in number 48.

These attitudes or postures are ranked, in the 4th vol., p. 380, under what he calls the 5th species of luxury against nature: "The 5th species of luxury against nature is committed when indeed the

Quinta species luxuriæ contra naturam committitur, quando quidem copula masculi fit in vase feminæ naturali; sed indebito modo, v. g. stando, aut dum vir succumbit, vel a retro feminam, cognoscit, sicut equi congreguntur, quamvis in vase femineo. Vol. 4, p. 380.

He tells us in the 4th volume, p. 380, that "these modes

introduce mortal sin according to the danger of losing seed; for this reason, to wit, that the

Possunt autem hi modus inducere peccatum mortale juxta periculum perdendi semen, eo quod scilicet semen viri communiter non possit apte effundi usque in matrem seminæ.—*Dens*, tom. 4, p. 380.

Often happens. How did he know? It must be from practice or inquiry.

Severely censured. "And although perhaps the married say that they diligently guard against that danger (of losing seed), in the meantime those lascivious modes ought not to be excused from a heavy venial sin, unless perhaps through impotence,—namely, on account of the wife's crookedness,—the natural posture and mode cannot be kept, which is, that the woman lie under the man." Et quamvis forte conjuges dicant, quod illi periculo diligenter præcaveant, illi interim lascivi modi a gravi veniali excusari non debent, nisi forte propter impotentiam, v. g. ob curvitatem uxoris nequeat servari naturalis situs et modus, qui est ut mulier succumbat viro.—*Dens*, tom. 4, p. 380.

Reason. Besides a crooked back there is another reason, namely, heavy pregnancy, for which he says the clergy may permit

(from behind)

Si non subsit perditionis periculum, ex immutatione situs, poterunt licite sic congregari, si mutatio illa ex necessitate fiat v. g. ne fœtus suffocetur.—*Dens*, v. 7, p. 154.

Minuitur periculum perdendi semen, si verum sit, quod dicunt Sanchez, Billuart, Preinguez, scilicet quod in matrice sit naturalis vis attractiva seminis, ut in stomacho respectu cibi.

Nota quod in præfatis modis non tantum peccetur con-

The danger of losing the seed is lessened if that be true which is said by Sanchez, Billuart, and Preinguez, to wit, that

Take note, that in the aforesaid ways the parties

tra castitatem, sed etiam contra justitiam, juxta dicta Num. 45.: ita ut actus illi induant quandam malitiam adulterii, præter peccatum mutui scandali.

Debet finis esse legitimus, de quo et quomodo ratione finis peccati possit, dictum est Num. 51 et sequentibus.

Per particulam "sine damno" importatur cendum esse damnum tum proli conceptæ et concipiendæ, tum ipsorum congradientium, de quibus egimus Num. 47.

Verbum "solve" importat obligationem solvendi sive reddendi debitum legitime petitum, de qua obligatione diximus Num. 46 et sequentibus.

Per verbum "cohære" intelligitur cohærentia usque ad perfectam copulam, seu seminationem perfectam ita ut per se mortale sit, inchoatam copulam abrumpere, propter periculum pollutionis in utraque vel alterutra

sin not only against chastity, but even against justice, according to what has been said in No. 45; so that those acts invest themselves, as it were, with the malice of adultery, besides the sin of mutual scandal.

The "end" ought to be legitimate, concerning which, and in what manner the parties may commit sin with regard to the end, we have treated in No. 51, and those following it.

The words "without loss" import that care must be taken that no injury be done to an offspring already conceived, or that about to be conceived, or to the parties themselves meeting in the act of coition, concerning which we have treated in No. 47.

The word "pay" imports the necessity of paying the debt when legitimately asked, concerning which we have treated in No. 45, and those following it.

By the word "cohære" is understood the necessity of coherence or of sticking close till the act of copulation is perfected, or until the parties spend completely; so that it is in itself a *mortal sin* to break off an act of

parte: Sanchez, Pontius, Billuart et alii dicunt quidem, id tantum esse veniale, si cessante omni periculo pollutionis in utroque, fiat ex mutuo consensu, antequam saltem femina seminaverit; sed ipsi fatentur periculum illud ordinarie subesse.

Locus debet esse actui conjugali proportionatus, adeoque non publicus seu talis, in quo ab aliis videatur, et sic potest esse mortalis ratione sacrilegii, si sit locus sacer. Vide Num. 48.

Quomodo ratione temporis in actu conjugali peccari possit. Vide Num. 47.

Quoad tactus libidinosos, quos conjugati exercent erga corpus alterutrius, il sunt mortaliter mali, si fiant cum pollutione alterius, vel ejus periculo.

Si absit periculum pollutionis, et ordinentur ad copulam, tunc vel ad eam ne-

coition when commenced, on account of the danger of pollution in both or either of the parties. Sanchez, Pontius, and other divines say that if the act be broken off without danger of pollution in both, and by mutual consent, at least before the woman spends, it is only a venial sin; but those writers themselves admit that to cut short the act is ordinarily attended with that danger.

The place ought to be proportioned to the conjugal act, and therefor not public, nor such as that the act may be seen by others, and thus it may be a mortal sin by reason of the scandal, as also by reason of the sacrilege, if the place be sacred. See No. 48.

How, with regard to the circumstance of time, sin may be committed in the conjugal act, see No. 47.

As to the libidinous touches which the married practise on the body of one another, they are *mortally sinful* if they are done with pollution, or with danger thereof.

If there be no danger of pollution, and if they be done in order to copulate,

cessarii sunt, et sic non sunt peccaminosi, vel non sunt ad eam necessarii et erunt venialiter mali, quia solius causa voluptatis haberi supponuntur.

Si tactus illi secluso pollutionis periculo, non referantur ad copulam, non ita convenientiunt authores; docent plerique, quod si sint adeo infames, ut nequidem ex copulae intuitu excusentur a gravi peccato, eos esse mortaliter malos: si vero sint tactus ordinarii, nec diu in eis sistatur, docent plurimi contra eosdem esse tantum venialiter malos: quia voluptas illa non quæritur extra limites matrimonii.

The same obscenities are inculcated in the Class Books at Maynooth, from one of which the following passage on the doctrine of touches is extracted:—

Quid sentiendum sit si tactibus obscaenis inter conjuges?

R. Sambovius ea de re consultus reposuit 1o, tactus in honestos, si exerceantur cum periculo pollutionis esse

then they either are or are not necessary for that purpose; if they are necessary, they are not sinful; if they are not necessary, they are venially sinful, because they are supposed to be practised for the sake of pleasure alone.

If those touches, though the danger of pollution be excluded, have no reference to copulation, authors are not so agreed. Most writers teach that, since they are so infamous as not to be excused from weighty sin when done even with a view to copulation, they are mortally sinful; but if the touches be ordinary, and not be persevered in for any length of time, divines in great numbers teach against the same, that they are only venially sinful, because that pleasure is not sought without the limits of matrimony.

What must we think about obscene touches between man and wife?

Answer. Sambovius, having been consulted on that affair, replied: 1st, that dishonest touches, if they be exercised

peccata lethalia. 2o, Eos nullatenus esse peccata si absque pollutionis periculo adhibeantur ut necessarii ad usum matrimonii, nec pravo fine fiant, quia conjuges tendunt ad aliquid honestum. Si tamen perverso motivo, v. g. propter voluptatem exerceantur, sunt culpae veniales, etiam si ad matrimonium ordinentur. 3o, Si non adhibeantur in ordine ad usum matrimonii; nec adit pollutionis periculum, sunt culpae veniales, juxta eundem Doctorem, quem sequuntur alii Theologi qui tamen confitentur esse quodam tactus adeo turpes et infames ut a mortali excusari nequeant, sive ad matrimonium referantur sive non.—*Tract. de Matrimonio*, p. 502.

with danger of pollution, are deadly sins. 2d, that they are not sins at all if, without danger of pollution, they be applied as necessary to the use of matrimony, and be done with no vicious end, because the married couple are preparing for something honest. If, however, they (the touches) be exercised from a perverse motive, for example for pleasure, they are venial sins, although they be designed for matrimony. 3d, if they be not applied in order to the use of matrimony, and if there be no danger of pollution, they are venial sins, according to the same doctor, whom other divines follow, who nevertheless admit that some touches are so base and infamous that they cannot be excused from mortal sin, whether they have reference to matrimony or not.—*Maynooth Class Book*, Tract on Matrimony, p. 502.

Tractus libidinosus proprii corporis in uno conjuge similiter est mortalis; si fiat cum periculo pollutionis. Si absit periculum pollutionis, et fiat com parte absente, ex communi sententia inquit Billuart, est etiam mortalis: quia actus ille tunc ex natura sua non ordinatur ad copulam, sed ad pollutionem; idemque propter rationem

In like manner, if the husband libidinously touch his own body, or the wife hers, it is a mortal sin if it be done with danger of pollution.

If there is no danger of pollution, and if it be done in the absence of the partner, it is nevertheless, says Billuart, in the common opinion, a mortal sin, because

eandem sustinent, varii de delectatione venerea circa copulam, comparte absente: de quo latius in tractatu de peccatis.

Si vero fiat comparte præsente, potest fieri sine peccato, dum fit ex intentione copulæ; si adsit intentio copulæ, dicunt aliqui eum tactum esse mortalem; sed distinguit Billuart, scilicet, dicendo eum non esse mortalem, si conjux saltem habeat animum copulandi, casu quo excitetur; mortalem vero, si nullo modo habeat animum copulandi, licet excitetur, quia tunc tactus ille potius ordinatur ad pollutionem, quam ad actum conjugalem.

Quæ de tactibus libidinosis dicta sunt, applicari possunt libidinosis osculis, amplexibus, aspectibus, colloquiis, &c., videri etiam possunt, quæ docentur tract. De Temperantia.

that act is then, from its own nature, not designed for copulation, but pollution; and for the same reason various writers maintain the same opinion on venereal delight about copulation, and the partner being absent, on which more at large in the tract on sins.

If, indeed, it be done in the presence of the partner, it can be done without sin, providing it be done with the intention to copulate; but if there be no intention to copulate, some writers say that these touches are a mortal sin; but Billuart distinguishes, to wit, by saying that they are not a mortal sin if the husband have at least a mind to copulate, in which case he may be excited; but that they are a mortal sin if he have by no means a mind to copulate, though he be excited, because then those touches are designed rather for pollution than for the conjugal act.

What we have said on libidinous touches can be applied to libidinous kisses, embraces, looks, conversation, &c. You may also see what is taught in the tract on Temperance.

An uxor possit se tactibus excitare ad seminationem, si a copula conjugali se retraxerit, maritus, postquam ipse seminaverit, sed antequam seminaverit uxor?

R. Plurimi negant; eo quod, cum vir se retraxerit, actus sit completus, adeoque illa seminatio mulieris feret peccatum pollutionis: alii vero affirmant; quia ista excitatio spectat ad actus conjugalis complementum et perfectionem; excipiunt tamen casum, ubi periculum est ne semen ad extra profundatur.

Seed received from the man, which the excitement may cause her to eject.

Hanc posteriorem sententiam ad exorbitantes opiniones laxiorum refert Henricus a S. Ignatio.

Quomodo actui conjugali obstet votum diximus No. 49.

No. 49. From the many references to preceding numbers, from which no extracts have been taken, it will appear to the reader that, in making this pamphlet, Dens has by no means been exhausted. I can honestly assure him I might easily make up a large volume of the same sort of matter. Foul and filthy as this sample of Popish theology is, I have left some more foul and filthy behind me.

Can a wife by touches excite herself to spend, if the husband has withdrawn himself from conjugal copulation after he has spent himself, but before the wife has spent?

Answer. Very many say no; because, when the husband has withdrawn himself, the act is complete, and therefore that spending of the woman would be a sin of pollution; but others say yes, because that artificial mode of excitement tends to the completion and perfection of the conjugal act; they, however, except the case where there is danger lest the seed may be poured forth to the outside.

Henricus from St. Ignatius refers this last opinion to the exorbitant opinions of the more lax divines.

How a vow may oppose itself to the conjugal act we have said in No. 49.

Observandum, quod non deceat hæc lubrica in concionibus, aut alibi publice proponere descendendo ad particulares casus: licet tamen et convenit aliquando generaliter et sine explicatione dicere etiam publico quod conjugati possint usu matrimonii peccare, et quidem mortaliter, quod S. Franciscus Salesius declarat hac similitudine; sicut potest quis in propria domo ex propria domo ex proprio vino se inebriare.

Congregations. “In concionibus,” in the congregations, or in public discourses addressed to such meetings.

It is to be observed that it is not fit to propose these slippery subjects publicly in the congregations or elsewhere, by descending to particulars; however, it is sometimes lawful and befitting to say, in general terms and without explication, even before the public, that the married may, in the enjoyment of matrimony, commit sin, nay, even mortal sin, which St. Francis, of Sales, declares under this simile—as a man may intoxicate himself in his own house with his own wine.

APPENDIX TO THE NEW EDITION.

THREE of the most striking characteristics of the *perverted* or *fallen church*, which both St. Paul and St. John foresaw in prophetic vision was to arise on the ruins of the Roman Empire, and make war with the servants of the Most High, “and to overcome them” for a season, are represented by those inspired writers to be, *deceitfulness*, *bloodthirstiness*, and *impurity*.

“Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish.”—*2 Thess. ii. 9, 10.*

“And I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns.

“And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornications.

“And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.

“And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus; and when I saw her I wondered with great admiration.”—*Rev. xvii. 3-6.*

In relation to the first of these distinctive marks of the “beast,” the writer of the appendix to the second American, from the ninth Glasgow, edition of the *Protestant* (a work that every republican should read), makes the following pertinent remarks:—

“The descriptions of ‘the working of Satan,’ which reigns at Rome, are precisely assimilated to its character as revealed by *the spirit of prophecy*. In the minor transactions of life, or with his confederates, a Papist may perchance act uprightly; but in all the complicated questions and relations in which he is involved as a resident of a Protestant country it is absolutely impossible that he who succumbs to the priestly yoke can act consistently with rectitude and truth. He is taught from his earliest youth that dissimulation, equivocations, mental reservations, and even direct falsehoods, for his own benefit or for the good of the Church, are either venial sins or else meritorious acts. He is assured that no performances are more conformable to the commands of the Holy Roman Church, that no good works are more expiatory of mortal transgressions, and that no religious services are more acceptable to God, than deceiving, obstructing, and injuring heretics, and that the mischief which would be criminal if done to a Papist becomes a subject of reward if executed upon a Protestant.

“The doctrine of faithlessness in transactions with heretics, so as to sanction the violation of all treaties, covenants, promises, and contracts, is ratified by popes and councils as obligatory upon all Papists when it can be achieved with safety and impunity; and to accomplish the desired result, the most corrupt and wilful falsehood and perjury exchange their inherent depravity, and are metamorphosed into saintly virtues. In addition to this wickedness, it must be remembered that the dispensing power claimed and exercised by the Pope nullifies all holiness and sanctifies all vice.

“The history of the popedom is one incessant proof of the truth which the apostle Paul declared to the Thessalonians, Epistle 2, Chapter 2, that the ‘falling away’ of the church, and the subsequent enthronement in the temple of God of the man of sin and the son of perdition, should comprise a ‘system of strong delusions and all deceivableness of unrighteousness,’ which he emphatically denounces as ‘*the lie*.’

“One of the most convincing demonstrations of the divine origin of the Holy Scriptures is this—that its most

extraordinary and apparently incredible predictions should be exemplified with minutely accurate precision by the very craftsmen who boast that they are the only church of Christ, and yet who are so ignorant of the truth which divine revelation announces that they are unconscious of their own steadfast fulfilment of all the turpitude against which the curse of God is promulgated. . . .

“Travellers with one accord assure us that truth is not to be found in Popish countries; not evangelical doctrine, because that blessed gift of God is not sought after among Papists; not that sincerity and veracity which are essential to the existence of society; there is truth just sufficient to retain the national compact from dissolution, and no more.

“A Papist, if he conforms to his church, adopts its casuistry, as it has been authoritatively described, and copies the examples of those whom he considers as infallible and delegates of God, must unavoidably be a deceiver, for the ‘truth is not in him.’”

So striking has been the fulfilment of these prophecies, even in the most minute shades and particulars, that the transcriber of these notes is bold to say that it is utterly impossible that an intelligent man, having his mind open to conviction, can thoroughly study the history of the Papal church, and compare its progress, its doctrines, and its practices with the writings of St. Paul and St. John, and not acknowledge that they must have been divinely inspired. This is no empty speech. It is what every man of candor and sense will be forced to own, however *rank* may be his infidelity, if he will but make Romanism and the Scriptures his peculiar study for a *few months only*. When the “beast” shall come into judgment; when the nations that have so long deceived “shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh and burn her with fire” (Rev. xvii. 9), then will mankind begin to look into the truth of these most remarkable prophecies, and “learn wisdom.” “And here is the mind which hath wisdom” (Rev. xvii. 9).—*Note by Transcriber.*

BLOODTHIRSTINESS OF THE PAPAL CHURCH.

The same writer says: “A Papist is necessarily cruel. Nothing can more graphically depict Romanism in this de-

cisive attribute than the exterior appearance of the 'beast' as John viewed him (Rev. xiii. 2-11): 'The beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth was as the mouth of a lion; and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And he had ten horns like a lamb, but he spake as a dragon.' This is the condensed history of Popery during its whole past duration; it is the picture of the present Roman court; and when the papal system loses these expressive symbols it will cease to exist.

"This beast is delineated as a *leopard*, for his activity and fierceness; with a *bear's* paw, for his brutal and griping rapacity; a *lion*, for his ferocity, power, and terrific ravaging; a *dragon*, for his devilish rage and deceitfulness; a mother of harlots, for her sorceries and monstrous impurity; and a drunken harlot, intoxicated and infuriated with Christian blood, to unfold her unnatural licentiousness and her unparalleled sanguinary and savage disposition. If no other proof of the inspiration of the H^ly Scriptures could be adduced, this luminous and minutely exact portrait of the Roman anti-Christian hierarchy would demonstrate infallibly their divine origin and veracity; for Popery always has been, it is now, and *it ever will be*, until it is exterminated, the restless and crafty, the incessant and voracious, the fearful and destructive enemy of mankind.

"It is the cement of Romanism that out of the Popedom there is no salvation, and that it is a heaven-appointed duty, if it can be executed without danger, to murder every man, woman, and child who will not submit to the Roman Pontiff, or, as in imitation of the ancient heathen Arch-Flamen and high priest, he blasphemously calls himself Pontifex, Optimus, Maximus. Upon this subject, in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, lib. 6, Decretalium, are the subsequent most edifying enactments:—

"Cap. 9, page 137. 'Non valeat, etc. All laws by which the office of a heresy-hunter is obstructed, are null and void.' "

By this canon law the Constitution of the United States of America, and that of all the individual States with the excep-

tion of Louisiana, are null and void, for these all protect *heretics* from being pursued by the "heresy-hunter." The constitution of Louisiana, framed when Catholics were very influential in that State, and expecting, no doubt, eventually to absorb all power, contains no clause guaranteeing liberty of conscience. Should, then, the legislative powers fall into the hands of the Papists, there is nothing in the fundamental code of Louisiana to prevent the establishment and exercise of the office of a "heretic-hunter." Will not the people of that State see to this feature in its constitution, and remedy it before it is too late?—*Note by the Transcriber.*

"Cap. 9, page 137. 'Officium, etc. The office of an inquisitor for heresy does not expire by death.'

"Cap. 19, page 142. 'Bona hereticorum, etc. The property of heretics is rightfully confiscated.'

"Cap. 6, page 135. 'Ordinarii, etc. Prelates, vicars-general, and their delegates and inquisitors, may enforce persons who have secular jurisdiction to execute their sentence upon heretics.' But the punishment by the merciful Papists for heresy is prior torture in the most excruciating forms and final roasting to ashes amid the shouts and exultations of the delighted Babylonians.

"It is a fact attested by all those who have been converted from Popish idolatry to the Christian religion, that ordinarily the last Roman principle of which they become divested is the spirit of persecution; and this is corroborated by the history of the reformers of the sixteenth century. They had renounced all the idolatries and mummeries of Popery; they had exposed its impious absurdities and drawn aside the veil which had concealed its matchless pollutions; and they had rejected the bondage by which they had so long been enthralled; but the feelings of persecution lingered within them, and long was it before the Papal delusion of the unity of the church and exclusive salvation was driven from their hearts. Like the dumb spirit (Mark ix. 17, 29), it was 'a kind of devil,' which came 'forth by nothing but prayer and fasting.'

"Papists (says the same author) generally are impure. This is a grave charge, but it is attested by evidence irre-

sistible ; for no part of the annals of Popery obtrudes itself upon our attention with so much offensiveness and with equal certainty as the extreme sensuality of the Roman irreligion. It is not to be deemed an adventitious or an unnatural morbid excrescence, occasionally developed in connection with a pure and healthful system, but it is the most essential, ostensible, and permanent quality of the anti-Christian confraternity. Romanism could not subsist without the utmost inordinate licentiousness. Popery never obtained any comparative influence until nominal Christendom substituted idolatry for devotion, and the traditions of men instead of the mandates of Jehovah, which unholy change unavoidably produced, as impiety always does, a laxity of moral principle, and, as the natural result, a dissolute life. All the nations called Christian have been sensual in exact proportion to the extent of the pontifical bondage in which they have been immured ; and at this hour, those individuals, families, and nations—perverse exceptions always excluded—are the most delicate and refined which have removed the farthest in distance from the confines of Babylon. These are historical facts, which the history of Europe since the death of Theodosius undeniably confirms, and which are oracularly corroborated by the existing contrasts on the American continent. There is nearly as much difference existing between the state of society in Boston and Lima, or Philadelphia and Mexico, as between the scenes anciently enacted in the tents of Soco-th-Benoth and the solemnities of a modern Christian devotional assembly.

“ This state of things and this diversity of moral character are naturally consequent upon the manner in which persons are educated. Nothing is more obviously true than the fact that they who are trained up in the confessional, where the questions and the canons which already have been cited are discussed and enforced from their youth, like the old Romans, must be ‘ filled with all unrighteousness.’ ”

“ It is unavailing to retort that many Papists have been indisputably holy men and women, because the admission of the extraordinary fact only verifies the almost generality of the rule against which so feeble an exception only can be alleged. There may have existed honest Jesuits, continent friars, and chaste nuns ; but this only proves that, through divine mercy, they were better than their avowed rules, and that their whole life was a ceaseless tissue of practical inconsistency. The true condition of society, and of course the temper of those individuals who compose it, in this reference may be accurately known from one feature which has universally existed wherever Popery predominates. A large proportion of the adult population pass their lives in celibacy. The Roman sacrament of marriage, of which the ecclesiastics of all orders and of both sexes are forbidden to partake, possesses neither sanctity nor attractions sufficient to interest even the laymen. Why should this anti-social state retain the ascendancy ? ”

“ This system, in the very highest degree, is unnatural. Not only is it destructive of national energy and opulence, but as essentially fraught with every species of disorder and crime, it must be in its own nature unspeakably reprehensible. If the cause be sought, it is found in the general and deep-rooted conviction that, through the evils which are practised and taught by the confessors to youth ; by the secrecy with which every atrocity can be perpetrated by the priests and his devotees, and by the knowledge which the parties have acquired of the operations of the Roman system, personal purity is in a great measure extinguished ; and, as it is the invariable result, both in men and women, all the tender emotions of delicacy, honor, confidence, and attachment, wither and expire.

“ No persons but the parties are acquainted with the horrid impurities of the confessional. Some idea of the vastness of the Popish ‘ mystery of iniquity’ may be formed from the citations which have been introduced in former sections. It is peremptorily enjoined that the questions introduced into the French and Spanish languages shall be

propounded to all persons, without exception, who attend upon the priest to confess their sins and to obtain absolution. The confessor may put them all or not, at his option; but that some of the most offensive of them are part of 'the examination of conscience,' as it is so wickedly entitled, which is adopted in this country, is known to all persons who are acquainted with this revolting topic.

"The inference is unavoidable. No Papist who complies with the requisitions of that system of impiety, to the obligations of which he professes to submit, can possibly maintain that pudicity of decorum, either in feeling or action, without which all the dignified qualities of man are eclipsed and degraded. This is the prophetic delineation of Popery in the Holy Bible; this is the record of Romanism in every country during a thousand years; and this is the universal character of Papists at this day, because Popery and carnality in all its multitudinous crimes are as inseparable as cause and effect."

The following are a few of the citations alluded to above:—

"Among the questions that are asked in Spain by the priests at the confession prior to the marriage ceremony is the following, addressed to the woman. It is found in the *Ritual Formulario; e institucion de curas para administrar los sacramentos*, etc. As Popery is infallibly, unchangeably, universally the same, according to the boast of the Romanists, those inquiries are propounded to every young Papist lady in America. The subject is the canonical impediments to marriage; and among other similar delectable and edifying exhibitions of Popery is, on page 605, this paragraph, under the head *De impedimento proveniente ex copula* (of the impediment caused by copulation). Here is the original Spanish, with a literal translation opposite:—

A dormido contigo el
padre deste P.? o alguno
de los hermanos de este
padre? o alguno de los her-
manos deste P.?

Hast thou slept

In the volume above referred to, written in Spanish, and entitled "Ritual Formulario," etc., are two hundred and thirty-six questions on the seventh commandment, which the priest is authorized and enjoined to propound at confession. Among those to be propounded to all females above the age of twelve years are the following, to which we append a literal translation:—

As pecado con algun perro
o con otro qualquier animal? Hast thou sinned with any

187. Etes donzella?

188. Etes amancebada?

189. Desde tu in ultima
confession, con quantos hom-
bres as pecado?

210. As palpado con tus
manos las verguencias de
algun hombre?

212. As consentido, que
toquen tus verguencias, o
a tus pechos, o a otra
parte de tu cuerpi? 213.

As besado les verguencias
de algun varon? o as con-
sentido que te bese a ti las
tuyas, deleytandote en esto?

231. As consentido que al-
guno o algunos hombres
duerman contigo fuera de
tu vaso natural? 235. As

tocado con tus manos tus
verguencias? o entrando los
dedos en ellas as venido en
pollucion?

187. Art thou a virgin?

188. Art thou a concu-
bine?

189. Since thy last con-
fession, with

210. Hast thou felt with
thy hands

The author of this “Ritual” for the priests of Spain remarks, towards the close of his book, that many other questions might be asked concerning the sins that men and women commit with each other, but declines inserting them because they cannot be expressed with *that modesty which the holy office of a confessor requires*.—Ritual Formularie, etc., pages 210, 231.

It is said by travellers that there is not probably one virtuous woman to be found among all the Catholics in Spain? Who that reads the above can wonder at this?

In the memoirs of Scipio de Ricci, a Roman prelate, are found the following, among other statements: “The nuns of Pistoia (a town of Tuscany) testified that the monks taught them *omnia flagita* (all vile things), and that they should look upon it as a great happiness *libidines satisfacere potuerunt sine infantum incommodo* (to be able to satisfy their lusts without the inconvenience of babies). The Jesuits also taught the *nuns pudenda exhibere virtus est* (to exhibit their private parts is a virtue), assuring them that they thereby performed an act of virtue, because they overcame a natural repugnance.”—Vol. I., pp. 131, 132.

Questions are propounded by these Jesuit doctors whether a Roman priest, monk, or nun, or any other Papist, deserves punishment for the following acts. We give the Latin, with a literal translation:—

Rem habens cum femina in vase prepostero; sodomitice patiens; crimen sodomiticum perpetrans; vitium bestialitatis perpetrans; causa libidinis masculum aut feminam rapidens.

To all these *sanctified* exhibitions of Jesuit Popery the reply is in the negative.

Lessau, prop. The following was one of the propositions publicly taught in the Jesuit College at Amiens, in the year 1658:—

Non peccant mulieres quæ se præbent conspiciendas adolescentibus.

Another: *Fegeli*, pars 4, cap. 8, No. 127, page 397:—

Cui obligationi subjectus sit qui defloravit virginem?

Qui corruptit virginem, preter obligationem pentendi, nullam aliam incurrit; quia puella habet jus usum sui corporis valide concedendi.

Women do not sin who exhibit themselves to young men.

To what liability is he subjected who deflours a virgin?

He who corrupts a virgin incurs no other liability than that of doing penance, because the girl has the right of yielding the use of her body to whom she pleases.

Ponder this, ye American parents who intrust your daughters to the keeping of Jesuits, and of nuns who are the tools of Jesuits:—

“To prove that the system of Jesuitism and monkery is the same in all parts of the world, the following testimony of a Hindoo Brahmin, who became a Roman priest, and migrated to Europe, was given no longer since than the year 1798: ‘The Roman priests in India are like the bonzes of Japan. The nuns are the disciples of Diana, and their nunneries are seraglios for the monks. They were more often pregnant than married women in general. The Jesuits had become Brahmins in order to enjoy the privileges of that caste, among which were exemption from death for crime and the right *rem habere cum omni muliere* (to have connection with any woman); because it is a Hindoo doctrine that a Brahmin priest *feminam sanctificat cum qua coit* (makes holy the woman with whom he cohabits).’” Vol. ii., pp. 216, 217.

The following questions (says the same writer), to be answered at confession, are found in the Philadelphia edition of “*The Key of Paradise*,” approved by Mr. Kendrick, the Roman prelate of Philadelphia, page 115. This is as far as Roman priests probably dare to disclose *in English, outside of the confessional*, in the United States of America. Read them, Americans, and then think of a fat, lecherous monk rising from his wine and viands, and re-

tiring to a secret apartment with your wife or daughter, for the purpose of teaching them the Papal way of salvation from the *book*. Remember, too, that on the trial of Kroeger in Cincinnati, it was disclosed in evidence that priests of Rome had the right, in certain cases (which they can make at pleasure), to require the attendance of their fair American penitents at any room or place they may deem *convenient*, and it was also disclosed that they can there chastise them with a *whip* or *other instrument* by virtue of their holy office and the Church's authority.

"1. Have you been guilty of adultery or fornication, and how often? 2. Have you desired to commit either, and how often? 3. Have you intended to commit either, and how often? 4. Have you taken pleasure in thinking on any improper subject, and how often? 5. Have you endeavored to excite your own passions, and how often? 6. Have you been guilty of indecent liberties, and how often? 7. Have you read indecent writings to others, and how often? 8. Have you exposed indecent pictures? 9. Have you joined in indecent conversation, and how often? 10. Have you committed any gross sin against chastity?"

Similar extracts are also given from the "Catholic's Manual," issued by John Power, the Popish vicar-general of New York.

What American father would dare to insult his daughter by proposing to her such questions as these?

And will they permit these Jesuit priests, who have, with the aid of the secret confessional, turned nearly all Europe, as it were, into a great bawdy house, to establish their diabolical system in America? Shall we permit them to go on and perfect their plans, until our wives and daughters, too, are drawn into their insidious nets, and become the slaves of their monkish lusts?

The following disclose a few of the fundamental principles of the Papal system:—

Emmanuel Sa, Aphor. p. 41. "The rebellion of Roman priests is not treason, because they are not subject to civil government."

Bellarmino, Controvers. lib. 5, cap. 6, p. 1090. "The

spiritual power must rule the temporal by all sorts of means and expedients when necessary. Christians should not tolerate a heretic king or ruler."

And further the same writer says, "The supremacy of the Pope is the main substance of Christianity."

Salmeron, Comment. Evan. Hist. vol. 4, pars 3, Tract. 4, p. 411. "The Pope hath supreme power over the whole earth, over all kings and governments, to command and enforce them to employ their power to promulgate popery; which mandate of the Pope they are bound to obey, and if they resist he must punish them as contumacious."

Polus, Card. de Concil., p. 91. "Petri cathedram super omnia, &c. Christ has constituted the chair of Peter above all imperial thrones and all royal tribunals."

Sanctarel, Tract. de Hæres, cap. 30, p. 296. "The Pope can depose negligent rulers, and deprive them of their authority."

Lessius, lib. 2, cap. 42, dub. 12, p. 632. "The Pope can annul and cancel every possible obligation arising from an oath."

Glossa Extrav., Pope Johan. XXII. "Dominus Deus noster papa. Our Lord God the Pope."

Brovius, de Pontif. Roman. Col. Agrip., cap. 1, 3, 16, 32, and 45. "Papa est Christianorum monarcha, &c. The Pope is monarch of all Christians—supreme power over all mortals. From him lies no appeal. He is judge in Heaven, and in all earthly jurisdiction supreme, and arbiter of the world."

Moscovius, de Majest. Eccles. Militant, lib. 1, cap. 7, page 26. "Pontifex Romanus est Index, &c. The Pope is universal judge, king of kings, and lord of lords, because his power is of God. God's tribunal and the Pope's are the same, and they have the same consistory. All other powers are his subjects. The Pope is judged of none but God."

Mancinus, de Jur. Princip. Rom., lib. 3, cap. 1, 2. "Papa est totius orbis, &c. The Pope is lord of the whole world. The Pope, as pope, has temporal power. The

Pope's temporal power is most eminent. All other powers depend on the Pope."

Ozichovius, in *Chimæra*, page 99. "Sacerdos præstat regi, &c. A priest excels the king as much as a man excels a beast. He who prefers a king to a priest prefers the creature before the Creator."

Corpus Jur. Canonici, Can. Authoritat. 2, caus. 15, quest. 6, part 2. "A fidelitatis etiam juramento, &c. The Pope may depose princes, and absolve their subjects from their oaths of allegiance. The Pope does by usual authority so absolve subjects from their oaths to their superiors."

Turrecremata, Card. ad Can. Alius 3, caus. 15, quest. 6, and de Eccles., lib. 2, cap. 14. "Papa potest deponere, &c. The Pope may depose emperors and kings. The pope may lawfully absolve subjects from their oaths of allegiance. If the king be a manifest heretic, the Church may depose him."

Urbanus II., Papa, cap. Excommunic., 47, caus. 23, quest. 5, apud Gratian. "Non sunt homicidæ, &c. They are not homicides who from zeal for the Roman Church kill those who are excommunicated."

Canon. Gregor. IX., Bulla, anno 1580. De foro competent. "Judex secularis, &c. No secular judge may condemn a clergyman; and, if he do, he shall be excommunicated."

Cajetan., Card. in Aquinat., quest. 99, art. 3, sect. ad 5, dub. "Persona cujuslibet clerici, &c. The person of every clergyman is sacred, that he cannot be subject to any secular power."

Directorium Inquisitorium, page 34, *Extravag. Boniface VIII.*, de Major. et obedien. "Omnis Christi fideles, &c. It is necessary to salvation that all believers in Christ should be subject to the Roman pontiff, and that he should judge all, but he can be judged by no man."

Ibid., page 117, Honorius III. "Domino excommunicato, &c. Subjects owe not fidelity to a governor continuing in heresy, but are released from their obligation."

Ibid., page 157. "Hereticus ipso jure, &c. Heretics by law are condemned."

Ibid., page 166, "Infidelis seu baptizatus, &c. A heretic, baptized or not, cannot be a witness." "Heretico non est, solvendum, &c. A heretic should not be paid what is due to him on a promise, even with an oath."

Ibid., page 173. "Omnibus est prohibitum, &c. All persons are forbidden to show any kindness to heretics."

Ibid., page 212. "Heretici inquirendi, &c. Heretics must be sought after, and corrected or exterminated."

Direct. Inquis., Literæ Apostol., page 12, Innocent IV. Papa. "Inquisitores compellere possunt, &c. Inquisitors may compel all secular magistrates to swear that they will keep the laws enacted against heretics."

"The *Directorium Inquisitorum* contains one hundred and twenty-four Papal bulls upon the subject of the Inquisition." And yet there is not a Romish bishop or priest in the United States but that will deny that there ever was any connection between that infamous tribunal and the holy see!

Brownson's Review, January, 1853 (published in Boston, and indorsed by two American archbishops and twenty-three bishops, as containing the true apostolical doctrine of the Papal church), page 46. "As she (the Papacy) has charge of the end, that is, of gaining the end, she must have charge of the means; and as the temporal exists only as a means to man's final end, she must, by virtue of the very spiritual authority which she confessedly is, have supreme power over the temporal, and plenary authority to govern it according to the demands or the utility of the end, and therefore in all respects whatever."

Ibid., page 48. "The Pope, then, even by virtue of his spiritual authority, has the power to judge all temporal questions, if not precisely as temporal, yet as spiritual, for all temporal questions are to be decided by their relation to the spiritual, and therefore has the right to pronounce sentence of deposition against any sovereign when required by the good of the spiritual order."

Ibid., page 48. "The Church, as a spiritual power, has jurisdiction in all matters that touch our consciences, the

law, the glory of God, or our supreme good. *Then she has jurisdiction over all our lives and all our acts.*"

Ibid., page 49. "If the Church is the spiritual power, with the right to declare the law of Christ for all men and nations, can any act of the State in contravention of her canons be *regarded as a law?*"

"The most vulgar common sense answers that it cannot. Tell us, then, even supposing the Church to have spiritual power, what question can come up between man and man, between sovereign and sovereign, between subject and sovereign, or sovereign and subject, that does not come within the legitimate jurisdiction of the Church, and on what she has not by divine right the power to pronounce a judicial sentence? None? Then the power she exercised over sovereigns in the middle ages was not a usurpation, was not derived from the concession of princes or of the consent of the people, but was and is hers by divine right, and whoso resists it rebels against the King of kings and Lord of Lords."

Ibid., page 54. "For every Catholic at least, the Church is the supreme judge of the limits and extent of her own powers. She can be judged by no one, and this of itself implies her absolute supremacy, and that the temporal order must receive its law, at least its interpretation, from her. *So she has herself always asserted by the mouth of all her holy doctors, her councils, and her sovereign pontiffs.*"

Ibid., page 57. "We must deny their premises, and that we cannot do without asserting the supremacy of the Church as guardian and judge of the law of God over both sovereigns and subjects, in *temporals* no less than in *spirituals.*"

Ibid., page 60. "We only ask our readers to bear in mind, that the Church is not herself the civil authority, and that though she possesses the temporal authority, *in radice*, she ordinarily governs the temporal order only through the temporal sovereign. She bears, by divine right, both swords, but she exercises the temporal sword by the hand of the prince or magistrate. *The temporal*

sovereign holds it subject to her order, to be exercised in her service, under her direction."

Pope St. Agatho, and Gregory XVI., in his encyclical letter to his bishops and clergy in the United States and elsewhere, 1832, say, "From what has been regularly defined (doctrine and discipline of the Church) nothing can be taken away, no innovation introduced there, no addition made; but it must be preserved untouched both as to words and meaning."

As atrocious as has ever been the Popish system, it did not fill its mission of accomplishing "all iniquity" until after the establishment of the "Society of Jesus," or Jesuits, who, after three centuries of continuous effort, have at length obtained complete control of the pope and the Church, and now direct its policy and movements. It is a rule of this society never to permit a member to publish any writing partaking of the character of doctrine until it has been regularly approved by the superiors of the Order. The following are a few specimens *only* of the published tenets and maxims of the Order, collected from the writings of their most celebrated and orthodox *doctors*.

The Scriptures:—"THOU SHALT NOT STEAL."

The Priests:—

Escobar, Theolog. Moral. Vol. 4, Lib. 34, Sect. 2, Prob. 16, p. 348. "A child who serves his father, may secretly purloin as much as his father would have given a stranger for his compensation."

Cardenas, Crisis Theolog. Diss. 23, Cap. 2, Art. 1, page 474. "Servants may secretly steal from their masters as much as they judge their labor is worth more than the wages which they received."

To this also agrees *Taberna*.

Gordonus, Theolog. Moral. Univ. Lib. 5, Quest. 3, Cap. 4, p. 826. "A woman may take the property of her husband, to supply her spiritual wants, and to *act like other women.*"

(In plain English, wives and daughters may steal from their husbands and fathers to satisfy their confessor priest.)

Emmanuel Sa, Aphorism, verbum *Furtum*, p. 161.

"It is not mortal sin to steal that from a man which he would have given if asked for it. It is not theft to take anything from a husband or father, if the value be not considerable."

Francis Xavier Fegeli, pars 3, cap. 6, Quest. 11, p. 158. "After a son has secretly robbed his father as a compensation, the Confessor need not enforce restitution, if he has taken no more than a just reward for his labor."

St. Aphoris, Furtum, cap. 6, p. 292. "He who, in taking what is another's, doth him no injury, is not obliged to make restitution."

(The *confessing* priest, of course, always to be judge of the fact.)

Note in the following extracts what high regard they have for the truth:—

The Scriptures: "THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS AGAINST THY NEIGHBOR."

The Priests:—

Filiucius, Mor. Ques. tom. 2, tract. 25, cap. 10, No. 316. "There is no mortal sin when one forswareth himself without perceiving it at all, and by natural inadvertence, though he who doth it hath his will effectually addicted to sin by an evil habit."

Ibid. id., cap. 11, No. 328. "With what precaution may we equivocate? By intending to use only material words. A person may begin to say, *I swear*. He can add this mental restriction—*To-day*, or in a whisper he may repeat, *I say*, and then resume his former tone, *I did not do it.*"

Layman, lib. 1, tract. 2, cap. 3, No. 6, p. 20. "He who by inveterate custom, a sort of imperious necessity, is transported to do evil, or to speak perjury, sins not at all, because a man cannot sin without rational knowledge and deliberation."

The same, lib. 4, tract. 3, cap. 1, p. 73. "It is not sufficient for an oath if we use the formal words, if we have not the intention and will to swear, and do not sincerely invoke God as a witness."

Sanchez, a very renowned author, in his work on "Morality and Precepts of the Decalogue" (Op. Moral.

Precept. Decal.), part 2, book 3, chap. 6, No. 13, thus decides: "It is lawful to use ambiguous terms to give the impression a different sense from that which you understood yourself. A person may take an oath that he has not done such a thing, though in fact he has, by saying to himself it was not done on a certain specified day, or before he was born, or by concealing any other similar circumstance, which gives another meaning to it. *This is extremely convenient*, and is always very just, when necessary to your health, honor, or prosperity. A man who makes, whether sincerely or in dissimulation, a contract of marriage, is dispensed, by any motive from accomplishing his purpose."

And further he says:—

"A man may swear that he never did such a thing, meaning within himself that he did not do so on a certain day, or—before he was born, or understanding any other such circumstance, while the words that he employs have no such sense as would discover his meaning."

The same, Op. Moral. lib. 3, cap. 6, No. 32, p. 29. "A person who hath promised marriage to another, whether it was made sincerely or only in appearance, is discharged by any reason from holding his promise. Being called before a judge, he may swear that he hath not made this promise, meaning he hath not so made it, because he may persuade himself in conscience that he is not obliged."

The same, Op. Moral. lib. 3, cap. 6, No. 42, p. 30. "St. Francis lawfully used the equivocation which is attributed unto him, when, being interrogated by the officers of justice if a malefactor whom they sought after went that way, he answered, *putting his hands in the sleeves of his gown*, He is not come this way; meaning where he had his hands. He might also have answered, He is not passed this way, intending the *particular place where his foot or his hand was.*"

The same, Op. Moral. lib. 3, cap. 6, No. 45, p. 30. "So often as it is lawful in our own defence to use equivocations, they may be used; though he who examines us do press us to answer him without making use of this very equivocation."

Bauny, Sum. cap. 6, conc. 4, p. 73. "He who maintains an heretical proposition without believing it, or who is a communicant among the Protestants without having his heart there, but out of pure derision, or to comply with the times and to accomplish his designs, ought not to be esteemed a Protestant, because his understanding is not infected with error."

Let every American ponder this maxim; it concerns him greatly.

Taberna, vol. 2, part 2, tract. 2, cap. 31, p. 288. "Is a witness bound to declare the truth before a legitimate judge? No; if his deposition will injure himself, his family, or property; or if he be a priest, for a priest cannot be forced to testify before a secular judge."

Escobar, tract. 1, exam. 3, cap. 7, No. 31, p. 74. "Is it lawful to suborn any person to swear to a false thing?" To which *Hurtudo* and *Sanchez*, with himself, answer in the affirmative. *Filiucius* thus replies, tom. 2, Ques. Moral. Tract. 21, cap. 11, No. 346 and No. 347, p. 206: "Any one, upon a lawful cause, may request a man to swear, though he will be forsown; and this thing is not evil in itself, to require an oath of a person who we know will forswear himself."

Charli, in his Propositions, No. 6, affirms that: "He who is not bound to state the truth before swearing, is not bound by his oath, provided that he makes the internal restriction that excludes the present case." (See *Filiucius*, previously quoted.)

Escobar: "Promises are not binding when the person in making them had no intention to bind himself."

Castro Palao: "In a question of right and wrong, a judge may pronounce according to a probable opinion, in preference to the more probable opinion, even though it should be contrary to his own judgment."

Molina: "Judges may receive presents from parties, when they are given them either for friendship's sake, or in gratitude for some former act of justice, or to induce them to give justice in the future, or to oblige them to any particular attention to their case, or to engage them to dispatch it promptly." *Escobar* unites in this opinion.

All of these principles are sanctioned by *Suarez*, in his "Precepts of Law," book 3, chap. 9, assertion 2, p. 473, where he says, "If any one has promised, or contracted without intention to promise, and is called upon oath to answer, may simply answer, No; and may swear to that denial."

(The idea, therefore, of obtaining truth from a thoroughgoing Papist upon any subject in which his "honor" is concerned,—and every Papist's honor is indissolubly conjoined with the Church,—is an absurdity so great that it cannot be listened to with patience, as long as the above quoted decisions remain the authorized dogmas which the Roman priests inculcate among their followers.)

CONCERNING MURDER.

The following miscellaneous decisions are extracted from the works of the regularly sanctioned Roman authors, of the very highest character and rank in that community.

The Scriptures: THOU SHALT NOT KILL.

The priests:—

La Croix, vol. 1, p. 294. "A man condemned by the Pope may be killed wherever he is found."

In his famous volume called "Aphorisms," *Emmanuel Sa* writes, "It is lawful to kill in defence of ourselves or another, or in defence of our property or honor. You may kill beforehand any person who may put you to death, not excepting the judge and witnesses, because it is self-defence."

Henriquez, in his "Sum of Moral Theology," vol. 1, book 14, chap. 10, p. 869, says, "If an adulterous priest, even aware of his danger, having visited an adulteress, is assailed by her husband, and kills the man in his own defence, it is not criminal."

Airault published a number of propositions. One of them (Cens. p. 319) says, "If a person attempts to ruin my reputation by calumny, and I can avoid the injury only by killing him, may I do it?"

"Certainly. Although the facts are true; yet, if the calumniator will not cease to publish them, *you may fitly kill him, not publicly, but in secret, to avoid scandal.*"

Lamy. "An ecclesiastic or a monk may warrantably kill a defamer, who threatens to publish the scandalous crimes of his community, or his own crimes, when there is no other way of stopping him; if, for instance, he is prepared to circulate his defamations unless promptly despatched."

Amicus, tom. 5, de Just. et Jure Disput. 36, sec. 4, No. 218. "It is lawful for a priest or monk to kill a man who threatens to publish some great crimes against him or his order. A monk who *feminam cognovit, quæ honori ducens se prostitutam esse tanto viro*, boasts of it, and thereby defames him, *may kill that woman.*" (It will be remembered attempts were made on the life of the young girl that exposed Krœger.)

The same, num. 131. "A priest may kill those who hinder him from taking possession of any ecclesiastical office."

Fergundez, Precept. Decalog. vol. 1, lib. 4, cap. 2, pp. 501, 655; and vol. 2, lib. 8, cap. 32, p. 390. "Papist children may accuse their parents for heresy, although they know their parents will be burnt for it; not only may they deny them nourishment, but *they may justly kill them*, if the parents would turn their children from the Popish faith."

"If a priest at the altar is attacked by any one, he may leave the ceremony and defend himself; and although he may kill the assailant, he may immediately return to the altar and finish the mass."

"If a judge decides contrary to the law, the injured person may defend himself by *killing the judge.*"

Guimenius promulgated his seventh proposition in these words: "You may charge your opponent with false crimes, to destroy his credit; and you may also kill him."

Bauny, cap. 7, p. 77. "We may wish every evil for our neighbor without sin, when we are impelled by a good motive;—thus, a mother may desire the death of her daughters when, from deformity or poverty, she cannot marry them to her satisfaction."

Molina, de Just. et Jure, tom. 4, tract. 3, Disput. 14, p. 1765. "An adulterer may lawfully kill the husband of the woman, if her husband, having surprised him with his wife, do assault him." *Tamburin* is of the same opinion. From which *Molina*, in his fourth volume, deduces this corollary, p. 1766: "A thief, having entered into a house to steal, in conscience may kill him who would punish him for his theft, if he cannot otherwise escape."

Again, in vol. 3, Disput. 16, p. 1768, he says, "Priests may kill the laity, to preserve their goods."

Escobar, tract. 1, exam. 7, cap. 2, No. 46. "It is lawful for a monk to kill a man who publishes great crimes against his order, as it is lawful for all men to kill, with requisite moderation, for the preservation of their honor." (Moderation in *wilful murder*—what a Christian doctrine!)

Escobar, Theolog. Moral, vol. 4, lib. 32, sec. 2, prob. 5, p. 274. "It is lawful to kill an accuser whose testimony may jeopard your life and honor."

P. 278. "It is permitted to kill any person who is proscribed."

P. 284. "It is lawful to kill those who injure our honor, or cover us with infamy before persons of distinction."

And further, in vol. 6, p. 170, "Not only is it lawful to offer or accept a duel, but you may secretly kill a calumniator if you have no other mode to avoid the danger, because *it is not murder, but self-defence.* You are obliged to refuse a duel, if *you can secretly kill your enemy*, because thereby you endanger not your own life, and you also hinder the commission of a new sin, in offering or accepting a duel."

Francis Xavier Fegeli, Quest. Prac. pars 4, cap. 1, quest. 7, num. 8, p. 285. "It is not mortal sin for parents to wish the death of their children, nor to desire the death of *any one who troubles the Church*, because considerable good is the direct and immediate object."

Dicastillo, lib. 2, tract. 1, Disput. 10, Dub. 1, num. 15, p. 290. "If a man becomes a nuisance to society, *the son may lawfully kill his father.*"

Escobar, Theolog. Moral. vol. 4, lib. 31, sec. 2, Precept 4, Prob. 5, p. 239. "Children are obliged to denounce their parents or relations who are guilty of heresy, although they know they will be burnt. They may refuse them all nourishment, and permit them to die with hunger, or may kill them as enemies, who violate the rights of humanity."

(Compare this brutal permit with that quoted from Fergundez, on page 92, and then you will see what effect these doctrines had in fostering the Inquisition.)

Gobatus published a work which he entitled "Morality," and in vol. 2, part 2, tract 5, chap. 9, sec. 8, p. 318, is the following *edifying* specimen of Popish morals: "A son who inherits great wealth by the death of his father may rejoice that when he was intoxicated he murdered his father."

And again, "Persons may innocently desire to be drunk, if from their inebriation any great good may arise."

(According to these combined doctrines, any man may innocently intoxicate himself expressly to murder his father for his wealth, and yet be guiltless.)

Casnedi, Cris. Theolog. vol. 5, Disput. 13, sec. 3, num. 169, p. 438. "I may rejoice in the death of my father, on account of the riches which I can obtain by it." Num. 170. "We should become familiar with this doctrine, for it is useful to all who desire property which can be obtained only by the death of another, especially secular offices and ecclesiastical dignities."

Busenbaum wrote a work denominated "Moral Theology," which was enlarged and explained by *La Croix*. In vol. 1, p. 295, is the following proposition: "In all the above cases, where a man has a right to kill any person, another may do it for him if affection move the murderer."

And again, on p. 163: "To avoid a great spiritual or temporal evil, a person may commit suicide."

Alagona, in his "Compend of the Sum of Theology" by Thomas Aquinas, quest. 94, p. 230, "sums" up all the Romish system in this comprehensively blasphemous

oracular adage: "By the command of God it is lawful to murder the innocent, to rob, and commit lewdness; and thus to fulfil his mandate is our duty."

These, Americans, are a few of the maxims, with their endless ramifications, that are at the present moment being instilled (through the confessional, and the Jesuit sisters who teach in the Catholic schools) into the minds and hearts of hundreds of thousands of the children of this country, multitudes of whom have been reluctantly withdrawn from our public schools by their parents and guardians, at the command of this accursed order of Romish priests. Shall such things be suffered? Shall we permit these sworn foes of religion, of morality, of the dearest rights and interests of mankind, thus to rear in our midst a separate caste, whose avowed object is to overthrow our institutions, and sweep Protestantism from the earth with fire and sword? This is no idle declaration—no false assertion—but the living truth. Let us, Americans (again I say), unite, heart and hand, and resolve that this sect, that have already been expelled scores of times from different countries for their plottings, their secret machinations, and their unearthly crimes, shall not be permitted to plant themselves and their "doctrines of devils" in our midst. There is evidence enough to convict them, as a society, of traitorous designs against our country; and if our constitution will not permit of their expulsion, let us amend it, so that *it will*. It is an imperative duty that we owe to ourselves and to our posterity—who will inevitably have to maintain their freedom at the expense of oceans of fraternal blood—if the machinations of the Jesuits, now in our midst, are not nipped in the bud, and before they have involved us in an interminable civil war, as is ever their practice in all countries in which they are permitted to exist, and in which they are at the same time excluded from power.

THE CONFESSORIAL. WHAT IT IS.

HISTORY OF CONFESSION.

Confession is defined as a verbal acknowledgment of sin ; in the Romish system, it is made to a priest in order to obtain absolution.

Cathcart declares the Confessional, and auricular confession, to be the chief executive of the Romish system, by which the decrees of the infallible Church are applied and carried out with an unequalled measure of minuteness and rigor.

Its history, particularly in this connection, as we are about to give a glimpse of its enormities and iniquities, is of the highest importance.

That secret confession in the ear of a priest, to secure his absolution, was entirely unknown in the early churches, is admitted by nearly all the writers upon the subject. Father Chiniquy calls attention to the fact that in all the New Testament, and in all the earlier writers of the Church, not one hint is there of *auricular* or secret confession. The language of the Old and New Testaments, of the Prophets and Apostles is clear enough ; it points out to the reader and to the student that it is to *God* and to Him alone that the reader is *requested* (requested, mark you, not *compelled*) to confess his sins. Even the lone passage of St. James, "Confess your faults one to another," no Roman Catholic, whether priest or layman, has ever dared to adduce in support of the dogma of auricular or secret confession. Why ? Simply because it refers to the method of reconciliation between those who have offended one another. By way of prelude, let us quote from Chiniquy's "Priest, Woman and Confessional" (page 225) : . . . "The more one studies the records of the Christian Church during the first ten centuries, the more he will be convinced that auricular confession is a miserable imposture of the darkest days of the world and the Church. And so it is with the lives of several of the early Fathers of the Church. Not a word is said of their confessing their sins to any one, though a

thousand things are said of them which are of a far less interesting character." This we shall, with the indulgence of the reader, demonstrate as fully as our limited space permits.

In the early days of the Church, it appears that a formal and open confession was first required in cases where persons guilty of gross apostasy desired to be again received into the Church. The testimony of all the writers of that time shows that public offenders were, from an early period, put to open or public penance, of which that of Theodosius, who never saw or entered a confessional, has become a matter of history.

The growth of private or auricular confession is more difficult to trace. Even those who would be most inclined to represent it as primitive, admit that for the first three centuries little or no mention is made of any such practice ; and, though they would fain attribute such silence to persecution, or the reserve known as the *Disciplina arcana*, or secret discipline, they seem inclined to admit that *private confession was a development of gradual growth*. Passages from such of the Fathers as St. Cyprian, St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nyassa, and others recommending the practice, are sometimes quoted in its defence, but only deceive those unfamiliar with these writers. An examination of the text shows that they are all in favor of open and not priestly confession, but individual, and not made to any human being *with the expectation of absolution*. Small prominence to any kind of confession beyond this, is given in the works of St. Augustine. Of telling his sins to human beings, this luminary of the Church speaks with contempt : "What, therefore, have I to do with men, that they should hear my confessions, as if they could heal all my diseases ?" (Ser. ii., in Psal. xxxi.)

St. Chrysostom makes strong declarations on the sufficiency of confession to God. Commenting on the words, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup," Chrysostom says : "He (Christ) does not bid one man examine another, but every one himself, making the judgment private, and the trial without wit-

nesses." (Hom. xxviii., in 1 Cor.) Daille (De Confess. Auric. lib. iv. cap. 25) has collected nearly twenty passages from the writings of this eloquent and orthodox Father, showing that *auricular confession had no existence in his day*.

The life of St. Mary the Egyptian, with all its minuteness of history, her scandals, her coronation, her long prayers and fastings,—all have been duly recorded for the edification of such of the faithful as may desire to peruse them, but not a word about confession to any one is there. Pontius, who wrote the life of St. Cyprian, mentions, not by one word, of his ever having either gone to confession or heard the confession of any one.

Gregory of Nyassa, who wrote the life of St. Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea, of the third century, and of St. Basil, of the fourth, makes it evident that neither of these great and pious men ever went to confession, or heard the secret or auricular confession of any one, and evidently lived and died without ever having heard of such a thing. St. Ambrose, as far as Paulinus tells us, evidently never went to confess. St. Martin of Tours, likewise.

St. Jerome wrote voluminously; and, among all his works, even among the letters to the priests of his day, and to several Christian ladies and virgins, who requested of him rules for the proper conduct of a religious (Christian) life, he gives not one line in favor of anything like auricular confession. Father Chiniquy quotes and translates from him (vol. ii., p. 203, Letter to Priest Neopolitanus) when speaking of the relations of priests with women:—

"Solus cum sola, secreto et absque arbitrio, vel teste, non sedeas. Si familiarius est aliquid loquendum, habet nutricem majorem domus, virginem, viduam, vel maritatem; non est tam in humana ut nullum præter te habeat cui se audeat credere."

"Never sit in secret, alone, in a retired place, with a female who is alone with you. If she has anything particular to tell you, let her take the female attendant of the house, a young girl, a widow, or a

married woman. She cannot be so ignorant of the rules of human life as to expect to have you as the only one to whom she can trust those things."

And so we might quote page after page. To summarize, all the early writers of the Church did not know what was meant by auricular confession as we now understand it.

The idea of the modern confessional is traced back by some writers to about this period; but historians generally agree that its establishment was a matter of doubt until the Middle Ages. But the gradual development of the idea deserves some trifling notice. The first step in this direction was the creation of the office of a Penitentiary Confessor (from *Pœnitentia*, repentance). About 250 A. D., through the fierce persecution of Decius, there were many who had fallen from the faith; among them were persons of different grades of criminality. As public penance was the universal law in all the churches for each notorious offender, a minister was designated in each centre of population to hear the crimes of apostates, that they might be classified, and thus be enabled (according to the customs of the times) to take their proper places among the sad ones at the church doors, or inside the porch, or near the pulpit on their knees, these being the grades of their sinfulness. In A. D. 390, one presbyter attended to this duty for all Constantinople; the office survived the scenes which had rendered it a necessity, and continued to fix the grade of public penitents. The presbyter attending to this duty was known as the "Penitentiary Confessor."

A certain noble lady, who had visited the Penitentiary Presbyter, was unfortunate in the church with the deacon. This affair was looked upon as a result of this sort of semi-confessional, and indignation ran so high that Nectarius, the bishop, abolished the office. This is the first instance of the suppression of so odious an institution; and Sozomen, who records it (lib. vii., cap. 16), tells us that the example was followed by the bishops of every region.

It is extremely possible that motives of piety, and a

wish to avoid the scandal of public confession, gradually led to the institution of private confession in the hearing of a priest. In and after the fifth century, confession of some sort, presumably public, was made an indispensable preparation for receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Confession, in its modern form, thus germinated, was of slow and uncertain growth. Isidore, of Seville, speaking of this practice in the seventh century, defined confession as of two kinds, the one of praise, the other of sin. "Both the one and the other are chiefly made to God." (Du Pin, vol. ii., p. 2, Dublin, 1724.) The second council of Chalons, in A.D. 813, in its thirty-third canon, declares: Some say that we ought to confess our sins to God alone; others affirm that they ought to be confessed to priests; both are done with great credit in the holy church so that we confess our sins to God, who does forgive them; and, according to the apostles' institution, we confess them to *each other*, and pray for *purges from sin*; and that which is made to the priest informs us how we ought to be purged from them."

Lanfranc, who became Archbishop of Canterbury in A.D. 1070, wrote a tract on the secrecy of confession. He tells us that while, in his opinion, the confession of *public* sins ought to be made to the priest, a layman may confess *private* sins to any ecclesiastic, or even to a layman.

Ibo, Bishop of Chartres, in the early part of the twelfth century, expresses, in his 186th letter, the opinion then beginning to become general: "That confession of common and small faults may be made to any one, but that great offences are to be confessed only to those who have the power of binding and loosing." (This power was claimed by the priests.)

Now this is substantially the Papal doctrine of to-day.

Up to A.D. 1215, the confession of sin was an *optional* thing in the Church of Rome. No canon or bull compelled it; it had been increasing in popularity for two centuries; it was highly recommended, but still it had no sovereign sanction, no authority to rule the Roman Church.

But this date, 1215, marks an important era in Papal history; for then, for the first time, *auricular confession was established by Romish law*. At this time Innocent III. was at the head of the Christian Church, and was anxious to establish a number of pet superstitions, among which was this very doctrine of compulsory confession. In this year he summoned the fourth council of the Lateran, whose twenty-first canon reads:—

"Omnis utrisque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata confiteatur fideliter saltem semel in anno proprio sacerdoti, et injunctam sibi pœnitentiam studiat pro viribus ad implere, suscipiens reverenter ad minus in pascha eucharistiæ sacramentum, nisi forte de concilio proprii sacerdotis ab aliquam rationabilem causam ad tempus ab ejus perceptione duxerit abstinendum; alioquin et vivens ab ingressu ecclesiæ arceatur, et moriens Christiana careat sepultura. Unde hoc salutare statutum frequentur in ecclesiis publicetur, ne quispiam ignorantiae cæcitatæ velamen excusationis assumat. Si quis autem alieno sacerdoti voluerit justa de causa sua confiteri peccata, licentiam, prius postulit et obtineat a proprio sacerdote, quum aliter ille ipsum non possit solvere vel ligare.—*Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini*, p. 257.

"Every one of the faithful of both sexes, after he shall have reached years of discretion, shall, by himself alone, faithfully confess all his sins, at least once a year, to his own priest, and strive to perform according to his own ability the penance imposed upon him, reverently partaking of the sacrament of the Eucharist, at least at Easter; unless, perhaps, by the advice of his priest, for some reasonable cause, he should judge that for a time he should abstain from partaking of it; otherwise, let the living be hindered from entering the church, and let the dead be deprived of Christian burial. On this account this salutary statute shall be frequently published in the churches, that no one may pretend as an excuse the blindness of ignorance. But if any one shall wish to confess his sins to a foreign priest, for proper reasons, he must first ask and

obtain a license from his own priest, since otherwise he would not be able to bind or loose him."

Calvin, commenting on this famous decree, says: "The barbarism of this diction is sufficient to deprive the law of all credit. For the good Fathers enjoin that: 'Every person of both sexes shall, once in each year, make a particular confession of all sins to the proper priest ;' but some wits facetiously object, that this precept binds none but hermaphrodites, and relates to no one who is either a male or a female."

And again, he asserts: "It is certain, from the testimony of their own history, that there was no fixed law or constitution respecting confession until the time of Innocent III. ; that its friends were accustomed to cite nothing older in favor of the practice than the Council of the Lateran."

The decree thus passed subjected those who refused to obey it to the worst form of excommunication ; which, in that age, meant a horrible death and the confiscation of all property.

The Council of Trent took up the work on the confessional begun by their predecessors of the Lateran, and making some changes and modifying it, gave it to the world. The completion of the task was left to those who lived in the age immediately after ; the result of all this labor is the confessional as it exists to-day.

RULES FOR CONFESSION.

Confession, the Roman Catholic Church defines as that third essential part of the holy sacrament of penance which deals with the accusation of *all* the sins one has committed, made to a priest or other ecclesiastic duly authorized to receive it, in order to obtain from him the ABSOLUTION or PARDON of *them*.

They furthermore declare that this is a duty of every man, woman, or child, and for the guidance of the faithful, in order that it may be made more easy, attention is called to the following rules:—

1. Imagine Jesus Christ before you in the person of your confessor.

2. Choose for your confessor a priest who has a great deal of mildness, a prudent zeal, and a true charity for sinners. Yet you must not think that, because you have done this, you cannot sometimes make your confession to *another* priest.

(In this we have evidence of the forethought of the founders of this iniquitous system. Doubtless the fear of punishment or of a severe penance was considered sufficiently strong to deter the penitent from making a full and complete confession ; the choice of a confessor was left to the individual.)

3. Do not look upon confession as a torture of the conscience, as infidels, scoffers, and heretics represent it, but as the humble self-accusation of a child, who knows the kind compassion of his father (the confessor), finds new consolation with every word, and will be sure that his father (the priest) will not be angry, but will forgive him gladly.

4. Never let a long time pass without holy confession, for by this means you will find it easier, and certainly will derive more profit from it.

(The design of this rule, to give the Church a better hold on the individual, through his fears more than his love, is apparent. The more frequent the confession, the better chance the priest has for preventing the spread of *heresy* in his flock ; and hence the easier it is for the advancement of the interests of the Church.)

5. If you have had the misfortune to fall into mortal sin, give yourself no rest until you have confessed it.

(And yet in No. 3, the penitent is specially warned about considering confession as "a torture of the conscience, as infidels, scoffers, and heretics represent it." Let it here be observed, in this connection, that mortal sin has been defined for you at considerable length, in the extracts from Peter Dens, in the previous pages.)

TO AVOID THE DANGER OF CONCEALING SIN.

In order to secure yourself from the danger of hiding some sin, through false shame, from the priest, call to mind:—

1. That, by concealing your sins, you become guilty of another sin.

(This is the sin of omission, and thus renders the confession incomplete, and therefore invalid. See page 46.)

2. If you conceal it from the priest, you cannot hide it from God.

3. Through concealment, you will only increase the trouble of your conscience, and sooner or later you must confess the hidden sin, or else die with it on your soul, and so be eternally lost.

(Does not this utterly refute the 4th admonition or rule of confession as before quoted? This working on the fears of the individual, as you thus see, is the mainstay of the whole system of confession. Remove this, and there is no necessity for confession, without which the Church as a church would soon cease to exist.)

4. Sin deserves shame; therefore, it is only another mark of your impenitence if you are unwilling to submit yourself to this mortification.

5. Such concealment exposes you to the danger of being put to shame in the presence of all creatures, at the day of judgment, and of burning forever in hell-fire. Ah, if a lost soul could come from hell, and find a priest, would he be ashamed to confess?

(In response to this, we dare say, that if the lost soul was that of a former priest, he might heartily be ashamed to confess, particularly after the memory of the debasing questions he has put to individuals—women in particular—in the confessional box, a sample of which we have already given the reader in the extracts in the previous pages.)

6. Tell me, would you not show to the physician of your body, your secret wounds, if you hoped to be healed? Much more should you discover the sickness of your soul

to your spiritual physician (the priest), if you would not die eternally.

(Note how this same argument for confession has been used over and over again. By the way it is used in this connection by the argumentation of the priesthood, one is almost led to believe that it is as much a doctrine of the Church as is the infallibility of the Pope. Mr. Casserly, as you will note in the introductory portion of this work, in his famous letter to the Editor of the *Journal of Commerce*, uses almost the very language of this sixth monition.)

EXAMINATION OF CONSCIENCE.

In order to prepare yourself to make a good confession, examine your conscience with care and diligence.

To examine our conscience, means to try carefully to remember how often we have sinned in thought, word, and deed, against the commandments of God and the Church. If we cannot remember how many times we have committed each sin, we must try to remember how many times we have committed each sin every day, every week, every month, or every year. In the examination of conscience, we should not be too hasty, or too superficial, nor too scrupulous in making it.

(But strike a happy medium, and ascertain for yourself whether there is not some palliation that would serve as a pretext for not going to confession, and thus easing your conscience, and rendering your priest's burden all the lighter. Not one penitent in a hundred thinks of this, but goes at it in a slap-dash, thank-God-it-is-over-with feeling of relief.)

WHAT IS IT NECESSARY TO CONFESS?

1. Every mortal sin must be confessed. If knowingly you conceal a mortal sin in holy confession, you will not only obtain no pardon for your other sins, but you are guilty besides of sacrilege. . . . If you have a doubt

whether you have committed mortal sin, or whether you have already confessed it, the best way is to lay this doubt, together with the sin, before the priest.

(Among the Latin and English texts you will find some interesting examples where even the learned lights of the Church disagree as to when the sin is mortal, and when only venial. An examination of the texts referred to,—see pages 21, 31, 35, etc.,—will show you that there are times when with so much learned discussion of the subject a priest has no easy task in discriminating, and must accordingly return an equivocating answer, or else ignore the subject totally.)

2. You must confess those circumstances which change the nature of the sin, or increase the number. For example: if the person with whom you committed the sin of impurity was a married person, you must mention this fact, because it shows that you were also guilty of the sin of adultery. It is also a much more guilty thing to utter a calumny in the presence of a large company than before a few persons; before the neighbors of the one you slander, than before strangers; or to steal a large sum of money rather than a small one; or if you take a small sum very often, rather than once or twice only.

(For circumstances, and how the confessor proceeds to draw out from the penitent all he wants to know, has already been explained, and with an example, on pages 43 and 44.)

3. You must confess the number of your mortal sins, as near as you can remember. If you cannot remember the exact number, then say: It was about so many times, or so many times more or less. If you have to make confession for so many years back, and cannot remember how often you have committed the sin, you should at least say how long the habit continued, about how often in a day, in a week, in a month, you fell into that sin; and if the habit was interrupted for a while, say how long.

(As if a drunkard, for instance, could say how often he was in the habit of drinking, or how frequently in a day he fell into that sin. But, on their part, the priests allege

that this is mere quibbling. They dare not deny the ability of a man to perform these things, or to tell exactly how often he sinned, and therefore, remembering that “to err is human,” only demand an approximation to the number.)

THE MANNER OF MAKING CONFESSION.

1. When you go to the confessional, do not press before others. While you are waiting for your turn do not distract yourself by looking around and talking. . . . If you have long to wait, you may read anything in your prayer-book which relates to holy confession, or say the Rosary, or meditate upon some spiritual subject.

2. Do not place yourself so near the confessional as to hear the confessions of those who are there before you. If ever you should by any accident hear any sin confessed, you are bound to keep it secret under pain of sin. Any-one who listens from curiosity is also guilty of sin.

(This is what is meant by the obligation of the seal, or, in other words, it is the obligation to secrecy of all those who should chance to overhear anything revealed to the priest during confession. See pages 13 and 14.)

3. When you are about to kneel down before your confessor, arouse yourself once more to a true contrition and sorrow for your sins, and imagine Jesus Christ *actually* before you in the person of the priest. Be very careful during confession to observe the greatest *possible* modesty in your words and manner. Do not speak too loud, so that persons around may hear, and not so low that even your confessor cannot understand you. If you do not understand what the priest is saying, do not let him go on speaking to no purpose, but tell him so at once.

(How very cautious they are! And how accommodating such rules are to the confessor. One would think that the good man who sits there, and whom the penitent is desired to imagine to be Jesus Christ, had not overmuch breath to spend on his penitents. In the character of the Son of God, the priest is exalted enough to say *I absolve you*,—

a form of expression which, it is known, was not in use before the beginning of the thirteenth century.)

IN THE CONFESSIONAL BOX.

When you have said the act of contrition, go to the confessional box, kneel down, and when you see the priest ready to hear you, begin your confession by making the sign of the cross: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *Amen.*" Then say: "Bless me, father, for I have sinned." Repeat the Confiteor, as follows: "I confess to Almighty God, to the Blessed Mary, ever Virgin, to blessed Michael the Archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, and to all the Saints, and to you, father, that I have sinned exceedingly in thought, word, and deed, through my fault, through my great fault, through my most grievous fault (*here strike your breast three times*): therefore, I beseech the Blessed Mary, ever Virgin, the blessed Michael the Archangel, the blessed John the Baptist, the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, all the Saints, and you, father, to pray to our Lord God for me."

Then first of all, tell your confessor how long it is since you made your last confession—whether that confession was a good one—whether you received the absolution of your sins from the priest—and if you have performed the penance imposed upon you.

Then proceed with the confession of your sins. When the priest questions you, be careful that your answers be brief and to the point, without covering up your sins, and without false excuses.

QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE CONFESSIONAL.

We present the following sample of questions put to penitents in the confessional without apology or attempt at palliation. We have obtained them piecemeal from authentic sources, mainly from those who had themselves undergone the ordeal prescribed for them by their priests or confessors.

'We have arranged them in as near the proper order as possible, and in the present state give them to the reading and thinking public of the day.

Now, one word in explanation. Protected by this atrocious doctrine of the secret of the seal, kept secret only by the penitent through his or her fears, the confessor has an opportunity for instilling into the minds of his hearer words, thoughts, or even discussions which rankle there, fester and corrupt the whole body and soul. He may put such questions as he pleases, not being obliged to confine himself to any particular subject or set of forms. When and how, he on his part may break the seal of sacramental confession, has been demonstrated on pages 11, 12, and following. But the penitent, on the other hand, is bound to inviolable secrecy, on penalty of sin, according to some writers, or "by a natural secret," as Dens says—in other words, believing his secret is safe in the hands of the confessor, and would not be revealed without his permission, or "license," he is merely silent on the subject because he imagines that what he has revealed in confession is buried in the most impenetrable darkness, and will never come to light or to the knowledge of any other person.

To all the questions put, the penitent is bound to render truthful and complete answers, as the first monition under the head of "Examination of Conscience" tells us. "If knowingly you conceal a mortal sin in holy confession, you will not only obtain no pardon for your other sins, but you are guilty besides of sacrilege." To those who refuse, or hesitate, the threat of eternal damnation is held out, and still working on the FEARS of the penitent, the confessor accomplished his object, and once more the poor dupe is again enslaved.

How long ago did you make your last confession? Did you then receive absolution? Did you perform your penance?

Was that confession a good one, or a bad one? Did you wilfully conceal any mortal sins? Did you go to holy communion after this bad confession? How many such sacrilegious confessions and communions have you made?

(See the first monition under "Examination of Conscience.")

Have you ever denied the Catholic faith? Have you openly rejected any doctrine of the Catholic Church? Have you spoken against any such doctrine? Have you disbelieved or indulged doubts against any article of faith? Have you suggested or encouraged such doubts in others? How often?

(The object of this and the next three paragraphs is to enable the confessor to nip in the bud any heresy which may have been spread in his congregation, and to keep abreast of the popular thought and prejudice, and thus be the means of preventing his sheep from wandering from the prescribed pastures. An example of Roman zeal in this direction was recently illustrated on a transparency carried in procession during the recent Catholic Columbus celebration in Philadelphia on the night of the 12th of October, 1892. It read: "One God, One Church, One Faith, One Country." And yet *not one paper* in the city had the hardihood to stand up and declare this, what a true American would not hesitate one moment to term it, RANK TREASON.)

Have you sometimes betrayed the Catholic faith by saying that all religions are good, or that a man may be saved in one as well as in another? How many times?

(This is naught but *bigotry* pure and simple. Protestants, and followers of other denominations dissenting with the Church of Rome, what think you of the above-quoted questions?)

Have you read Protestant Bibles, tracts, or other books upon matters of religion circulated by heretics? Have you kept them in your house, or sold them, or given them to others to read? How often?

Have you joined in the singing or worship of heretics, either public or private? Have you gone to their churches? Have you listened to their preaching? How often?

Have you consulted fortune-tellers, to find out things to come, recover things lost, etc.? Have you given credit to

dreams, taken notice of omens, or made any other superstitious observations? How often?

Have you exposed your faith to danger by evil associations? Have you united yourself to the Free Masons, or Odd Fellows, or any other similar society forbidden by the Church?

Have you, by your own fault, remained in ignorance of the doctrines and teachings of our holy religion?

Have you undertaken the study of the Holy Scriptures without the consent of your spiritual advisers? Have you studied them from false motives, or interpreted them contrary to the interpretation of the Church? How often?

Have you been guilty of blasphemy, by angry, injurious, or insulting words, spoken against God, against his power, his justice, his goodness, or other perfections? Have you pronounced any sacred name of God, or of the saints, in a blasphemous or irreverent manner? Have you spoken in a blasphemous or irreverent manner of sacred things, for example of the holy sacraments, the crucifix, the cross, scapulars, rosary, blessed medals, or sacred relics? How many times?

Have you abused the Holy Scriptures by any indecent or grossly irreverent application? Was it done in the presence of others? How often?

Have you been guilty of great irreverence in the Church, by immodest actions or conversation—by an indecent way of dressing, or some gross misconduct in gazing about, and laughing? How often?

Have you consulted dream-books, books of astrology, etc.? Have you kept them in your house, or given them to others to read? Have you made use of card-cutting, tossing cups, etc.? Have you been guilty of witchcraft, or made use of any spells, or like inventions of the devil? How often?

(There is scarcely among the great mass of Roman Catholic laymen one who has not some considerable super-

stitution. To-day the large consumption of holy water, scapulars, blessed medals, etc., is among the very class to which this question is especially directed. The sale of these articles forms quite an important item in the Church's revenues, as they are bought under the impression that the wearer or user, as the case may be, is miraculously preserved from harm. The ignorant, and they are the vast majority of the "defenders of the faith," believe in witchcraft, incantations, divination, fully as much as they do in the infallibility of the Pope, or his representative, the parish priest. And not unfrequently we find even priests, the so-called educated men of the Church, not only believing, but even practising measures calculated to prevent or overcome the evil-eye, or other malevolent charm, as the testimony of the following extract from the newspapers of recent date will show:—

"BERLIN, Nov. 20th.—A rather sensational case has just been settled by the Courts in Eichstadt, Bavaria. A Protestant woman, named Herz, began an action for slander against a Catholic priest, Father Aurelian, whom she accused of asserting that she had, by the agency of witchcraft, imbued her boy with the devil.

"In his defence, Father Aurelian called several Catholic clergymen. He testified that he had exorcised the devil from the boy, and supported this evidence by quotations from the writings of the fathers.

"The boy himself deposed that he knew nothing of the alleged exorcise. The woman was awarded small damages."

Have you sworn falsely, or what you did not certainly know, whether it was true or false? Have you sworn to do anything that was wicked or unlawful? Have you broken your lawful oaths? How often?

(Think you, reader, that the very confessor who asks these questions could answer them negatively and truthfully at the same time? Not if he has given much time to the study of the so-called "fathers," from the works of a number of whom we have given extracts in the pre-

ceding pages. We refer the reader in particular to pages 10, 16, etc.)

Have you had a custom of swearing rashly and inconsiderately by the name of God, by your soul, or by the way of imprecation upon yourself? How long have you had this custom? How many times a day have you sworn in this manner?

Have you sworn by the blood and wounds of Christ, or in any other blasphemous manner? How often?

Have you cursed yourself or others; if so, was it from your heart? Have you been accessory to others swearing, cursing, or blaspheming? How often?

Have you broken any vow or solemn promise made to God? Have you broken the marriage promise without just cause? How often?

(Here you perceive that it is admitted that a violation of the marital vows is, while not openly countenanced, permitted. Read page 25, and also pages 38 and following, and you will see for yourself.)

Have you done servile work on Sundays, or holy days of obligation, without necessity, or permission of your spiritual advisers? How often? Have you caused others to do the same?

Have you spent Sundays, or holy days, in taverns, or elsewhere? in dancing, gambling, in drinking to excess, in criminal walks and visits, or scandalous pleasure parties? Have you omitted to hear Mass on those days by your own fault?

Have you broken the second commandment of the Church, by eating meat on Fridays, and other days when meat is not allowed? Have you been the cause of others doing the same? How many times?

Have you been married clandestinely, without the presence of priest and witnesses? Was it even before a heretic preacher?

(The Council of Trent decided that all clandestine marriages, that is to say, those which are contracted

without the presence of the parish priest, and the two witnesses required by the rules of the Church, are null and void. It is deemed a most wicked, not to say detestable, thing that Catholics should forget all the dictates of piety and the doctrines of their faith so far as to be united like heathens before any other than a priest. Thus they regard the performance of the ceremony by a magistrate as bad enough, but still permissible, and then only in case of necessity, as when the parties who desire to marry live very far away from any Church or priest of the Romish faith. But marriage before a heretic or Protestant minister is considered a grievous sin against all their notions of propriety and morality, inasmuch as it is not regarded by them as a public performance of the ceremony, and, according to their tenets, unlawful as well.)

Have you married within the forbidden degrees, and without dispensation; or with an unbaptized person (*i. e.*, a person unbaptized in the Romish faith); or with some other impediment which would make marriage invalid?

(The forbidden degrees of marriage are very much the same as those set forth in the prayer-books of any denomination, the only difference being that, for a price, dispensation to marry within these degrees is granted by the higher officials, as bishops, etc. Difference of religion makes quite an impediment, as all marriages between Catholics and followers of denominations called heretical,—which is to say, all others,—are pronounced null and void. The union of a Catholic with a Protestant, or person excommunicated by the Church, is forbidden.

It is asserted that this prohibition is founded on reasons of the highest importance, as in the first place it is alleged that there is always something repugnant and unnatural in such unions. They quote in support of this dogma St. Paul to the Corinthians, where he asks: "What fellowship hath light with the darkness? or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?" Moreover, they allege that such marriages are unfavorable to domestic peace, quoting from St. Ambrose: "How can there be a sincere union of the

affections when persons are divided on the subject of religion?"

When taken to task upon this subject, they acknowledge that the worst feature of this sort of marriages is that they are dangerous to the faith of the Catholic party, or to the children. (See extracts from their own writer, *Dens*, pages 24, 25.) It is well known that either domestic attachment or fear of ridicule soon weakens the faith of one or the other, whilst the children easily follow in practice the example of the parent whose religion affords them the greatest liberty of indulgence. From this we can easily perceive why all these steps are taken beforehand to preserve the power of the priest over the Roman party to this marriage which they denounce as unlawful and sinful. After the step has been once taken, the priestly power over the conscience of the former penitent is broken, and he begins to investigate that which before he was compelled to accept without question.

While, as we have shown, the Roman Church condemns the marriage of a Roman Catholic with a Protestant as debasing and sinful, yet upon the payment of a certain amount of money, carefully proportioned to the means of the applicant, a dispensation will be granted, provided that the Catholic party will be allowed the utmost freedom of enjoying perfect liberty in the exercise of his or her religion, as the case may be; all or part of the children shall be educated in the Catholic faith; and the Catholic party must promise to seek the conversion of the other to the true Church by good example and other prudent means. Of course, moral persuasion of a very pronounced type is permissible, on the ground that "the end justifieth the means." When, under these conditions, a dispensation has been obtained, the marriage may take place without sin; but still the parties are given to understand that such unions are not approved by the Church. She only permits them (on payment of ten dollars or more) reluctantly and mournfully (?). She forbids them, it is claimed, to be celebrated within church walls, for therein lies holy ground, and refuses the Catholic party the consolation of

receiving the solemn benediction of the priest. Those who have not the means to purchase are denied the privilege, and can only be united by what the priest will tell you are unlawful means.

But in these decisions as to what is lawful and what unlawful in the eyes of the Church, the ecclesiastical authorities will persist in coming in conflict with the laws of the land. Under the law of many of the States in the Union, the simple acknowledgment by the man in the presence of one or more witnesses as firmly ties the knot matrimonial as if there had been yards of church ceremony performed. In the fall of 1890 a case came up in the courts of Philadelphia, before Judge Hare, which illustrates this statement. Annie Eichert, aged 18, of the Roman Catholic faith, was wooed and won by Morris Stein, a young Hebrew. As a result of the opposition to the match, came the news of their marriage in Camden, where no questions were asked as to their faith. Immediately her parish priest thought it high time for him to take a hand in the game, and so went around to the parental home and informed the bride's mother, a devout Catholic, who would never think of questioning the authority of the confessor, and relieved her apprehensions by informing the family that the marriage was null and void, and therefore claimed that it was as if no ceremony had ever been performed. Yielding to the combined influences of her parent, for her father was dead, Annie left her husband to live with her mother. Stein's parents and relatives, on the other hand, it is claimed, were displeased at his marriage out of his faith, and had persuaded him to apply for a divorce.

This information was conveyed to the Eichert family by Father Henry Dressman, who had advised the wife that her marriage was in the eyes of the Church null and void; and he informed her that she must consent to the divorce of mutual agreement, because the law considered her married, although the Church denied its validity.

On being brought into court to answer in a writ of habeas corpus, taken out by the husband, alleging undue influence upon the part of the bride's mother, the priest was called

to the stand to testify in the case. He claimed that Stein had informed Annie that he was not a Jew, and that the people with whom he lived were not his parents. From this he deduced that Annie's intention was not to marry a Jew, and consequently the mutual consent on her part was wanting; this mutual consent, he alleged, was necessary to make the marriage contract valid, and in support of this quoted from ecclesiastical authorities. The case was then left to the court. The decision is so important that we quote it as given in the newspapers of the time:—

"The judge then called the young bride to the bar of the court, and said to her: The case is simply this: You agreed to marry Morris Stein, and carried that contract into effect by going before a clergyman and becoming, according to the law of the land, his wife. Subsequently that marriage was followed by cohabitation, and the marriage was consummated, and you and he became of one flesh. Subsequently, upon direction of your spiritual adviser, you separated from your husband and refused to cohabit with him. That direction was founded upon what appeared to be a misconception. By the law of God your marriage was not null and void. The answer presented by you is erroneous in law. By the law of the land you are bound to him irrevocably. No act of yours can sever the tie. After three years have gone, your husband might obtain a divorce on the ground that you have maliciously deserted him. If you act under the advice given you, you will be a wife without a husband, and he will be a husband without a wife—a circumstance that would be of great temptation to you both. If you adopt this course, in morals and law, it may be most injurious to yourself. If you desire to break the contract and leave your husband, you are free to do so; but on the other hand, if you desire to live with him, you are also free to take that course. There is no one that has a right to step between you and sever the tie.

"The judge then asked Annie what her choice would be, and she modestly replied, 'My husband.'

"'You have chosen wisely,' the judge said.

“ . . . And the judge informed the mother that she should surrender the clothes of her daughter without recourse to law.”

Now let us see what the clergy had to say upon this subject.

Rev. D. J. McDermott, D.D., of St. Mary’s Roman Catholic Church, in his morning sermon on the following Sunday, denounced on the part of Judge Hare what he, as a member of the Catholic priesthood, regarded as an uncalled-for invasion of their rights of conscience. He explained the inconsistencies of some of the Church and civil laws, but said :—

“ When Judge Hare told the priest he had done wrong in advising the Catholic party that her marriage with a Jew was invalid before God and the Church, and that she should avail herself of the privilege the law gave her of refusing to live with Mr. Stein ; when Judge Hare pronounced the marriage was not invalid before God, and impliedly, at least, condemned the teaching of the Church, he certainly stepped outside his sphere. It is a judge’s office to expound the civil law, not to interpret the Divine law. It is his duty to lecture the clergy only when they advise something forbidden by the civil law, not when they interpret the Divine law, and in cases of conscience counsel their people to make use of their privileges under the civil law, to avoid an infringement of the law of the Church. The mistake of turning on theological side-lights in a civil court in determining a question of civil law tempted the judge from his legitimate sphere, and led him to revise and condemn a pastor’s solution of a law of conscience, and to pronounce officially not only what is a legal marriage according to the law of this State, but, moreover, what is a valid marriage according to the law of God. The office of a judge is to decide questions of civil law ; the office of a priest is to decide questions of conscience.”

Note how, in this slimy attack upon our American justice, this man,—this beforked priest,—has the impudence to assert that the law of the Church is the law of God, and to incite, by carefully worded discourse, his congregation into

secret conflict with the authority under which they live. If he thought the decision of the judge was illegal, why did not the priest appeal to the Supreme Court ? Simply because he did not *dare*.

(*A propos* of the above, we refer the reader to the note on page 25 of this work.)

Have you been ungrateful to your parents ? Did you despise them ? or even hate them ? Did you wish for their death ? or that some other misfortune might befall them ? How often ?

Have you given them injurious or insulting language ? or mocked and ridiculed them ? How often ? Have you cursed them ? How many times ? Have you threatened them ? or lifted up your hand to strike them ? How often ?

(It is interesting in this connection to remark the teachings of the learned doctors of the Church. We refer the reader to the quotations from *Fegeli*, *Dicastillo*, *Escobar*, *Gobatus*, and *Casnedi*, on pages 93 and 94 of this work.)

Have you provoked your parents to anger ? or caused them to swear or otherwise offend God ? How often ?

Have you stolen from your parents, or otherwise wronged them ? Have you squandered away their substance ? How much, and how often ?

(*Escobar* says that “a child may secretly purloin from his father ;” while *Cardenas* and *Taberna* agree that servants may purloin from their masters. *Gordonius* and *Sa* agree that like thefts may be committed upon a father. *Fegeli* says that a confessor need not enforce restitution where a son has stolen from his father not more than he considers a just reward for his labor.)

Have you been disrespectful and disobedient to your spiritual superiors, the bishops and priests of the Church ? Have you treated them in a haughty or insulting manner ? Have you taken part with the disaffected and the seditious ? Have you neglected to contribute to the support of your

pastors, of the (parochial) schools, and the maintenance of your religion?

Have you been guilty of the death of any one? by your own act, by participation, by instigation, by counsel, by consent? Have you ever attempted or intended to take the life of another? Have you engaged in serious fights, or injured others by blows, wounds, or other ill-treatment? How often?

(Compare the statements of *La Croix*, *Henriquez*, *Airault*, *Lamy*, *Amicus*, *Fergundez*, *Guimenius*, *Bauny*, *Molina*, *Escobar*, *Fegeli*, and the rest of the fiendish writers whose works are the acknowledged guides of the priesthood, and you will wonder that their names are not printed here in the bright red of *blood*. See pages 91 and following of this work.)

Have you endeavored to take your own life? / Have you injured your health by excess in eating and drinking? Have you been drunk? How often in the week, the month, or the year? Have you been the cause of drunkenness in others? How, and how often?

(Good father confessor, have you forgotten the teachings of your own authorities? have not *Busenbaum* and *La Croix* stated in their *Moral (?) Theology* that (p. 263), "To avoid a great spiritual or temporal evil, a person may commit suicide?" Why, then, the object in asking such a useless or idle question? You say you deny the authority of the Jesuits? Then you are denying the saviours of your Church. Without them you would cease to exist.)

Have you done anything to hinder the generation of the womb? Have you procured or thought to procure miscarriage by your own act, by your advice, or by your consent? How many times?

(O, good father, can *you* answer these questions truthfully? How many times have you given advice of this very character? You tell us that it is a mortal sin? Then listen, for we have a few quotations from your writers on morality; perhaps, in your old age, you may learn from even one who has no high authority in your Church.)

Marin wrote a book called "Speculative and Moral Theology," in the third volume of which, tract 23, disputation 8, sec. 5, no. 63, p. 448, is found the following sentence: "Licet procurare abortum ne puella infametur." The free translation of which is: "It is allowed to procure abortion, in order that a girl,—or woman,—may not be disgraced."

Again, in no. 67, p. 429, the statement is practically repeated, this time the application being "to conceal the infamy of *monks and nuns*." He further quotes, in this very same book, the agreement of such authorities as *Navarrus*, *Arragon*, *Bannez*, *Henriquez*, *Sa*, *Sanchez*, *Palao*, and others that a woman may use all other medicaments, besides the two or three he mentions, to *expel or destroy the foetus*. With this doctrine agrees *Egidius*, in his "Explication of the Decalogue," vol. 5, book 5, chap. i, doubt 4; and so also says *Diana*, in his work upon Morality, part 6, tract 8, resolution 27, thereby fully ratifying his sanction.

Have you desired the death of others, or wished them some great misfortune? How many times? Have you had the intention to injure or ill-treat others, if you could?

(Read what *Bauny*, *Gobatus*, and *Casnedi* say, as we have quoted on pages 92 and 94, and you will have the answer with which to parry this set of questions.)

Have you provoked, challenged, or struck others, or been quarrelling or fighting with them? How often? And what mischief have you done them? Have you excited others to anger or revenge?

Have you drawn the young and innocent into sin? Have you taught them some vicious habit? Have you spoken to them of dangerous or wicked things that they ought not to know? Have you thrown temptation into the way of the weak? Have you done harm to the soul of any one by giving scandal? How often?

Have you committed anything that you judge or doubted to be a mortal sin, though, perhaps, it was not so? How

often? Or have you exposed yourself to the evident danger of mortal sin? How often, and what sins?

Have you dwelt wilfully and with complaisance upon impure thoughts and imaginings? Have you, in fact, consented to them in your own mind? How often?

(See pages 47, 48, 55, and following of this work. As the sins against this and the ninth commandment, Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, are most grievous, and, at the same time, most *various*, the *prudent* council of your director (priest) will assist you, if necessary, *in a more particular examination*. *Garden of the Soul*, p. 199.)

Have you made use of impure language or allusions; or listened to it willingly and with complaisance? Was it sometimes before persons of the opposite sex? And before how many? Were the persons before whom you spoke married or single?

(For all this you are obliged to confess, by reason of the evil thoughts these things are apt to create in the minds of the hearers. In the note to which we have before referred —page 55, under the Extracts from Dens's Theological Works, note how the cunning of the priest weaves around the penitent a web from which there is no escape.)

Have you been guilty of improper and dangerous freedoms with any of the other sex? How far have you carried this sinful conduct? Was the companion of your guilt a single person? How often? A married person? How often? A relation? How often? Was there anything else in the quality of the person which made your sin more grievous?

(When a second person is concerned, the same distinctions must be made, whether the sin be one of thought, word, or action. From these and the following questions you may plainly perceive the reeking filthiness of the confessional, and find further proof of the very abomination set forth in the Extracts from the Prince of Licentiousness, *Dens*.)

Have you, by the freedom of your manners, or your im-

modest dress, been the cause of temptation to others? Was this also your intention?

(Note what he says on page 55 about the form of the confessional questions designed to be addressed "to a young girl, or a woman vainly dressed.")

Have you been guilty of fornication, or adultery, or incest, or any sin against nature? How many times? Was it with a person of the same sex, or any other creature? Have you designed or attempted any such sin? Or sought to induce others to it? How often?

(Pages 55 and following, also pages 78 and after, show specimens of the great and entrancing beauties of this system of iniquity which permits a priest to ask and require answers to questions which the penitent would blush to repeat elsewhere.)

Have you been guilty of self-pollution? or of immodest touches of yourself? How often?

(Our admirable author, Peter Dens, has set forth in his 4th volume, from which we make an extract on page 41 of this work, a complete definition of what constitutes perfect pollution.)

Have you touched others, or permitted yourself to be touched by others immodestly? Or given or taken wanton kisses or embraces, or any other improper liberties? How many times?

(See page 47, and following.)

Have you been guilty of seduction, or have you debauched any person that was innocent before? Did you accomplish your design of evil by force, or under a false promise of marriage, or any other deceitful promise? Or designed or desired to do so? How many times?

(We have been shown already how many precautions are taken to screen from merited infamy the priest who seduces a patient in the confessional. Note, in the case cited on page 31, how difficult it is to prove a case against the wrongdoer. The note on page 33 illustrates the punishment that falls on those who dare to denounce the guilty one.)

Have you read impure books or newspapers? Have you given them to others to read? Have you kept indecent pictures, or exposed them to others? How often?

(On page 38, it is admitted that the cases of conscience drawn up for the use of the confessor come under this very head. How interesting would be the confession of a confessor, if he dared to come out and reveal all the secret actions of his life, and submit to the very same ordeal which he has forced others to undergo.)

Have you abused the marriage-bed by any actions contrary to the order of nature? In what manner, and how many times?

(Of course, if the penitent does not understand this question, the confessor has an excellent opportunity to teach a lesson which must be to him edifying in the extreme. The veil of secrecy thrown around the confessional gives him that advantage over the penitent; for he is not *bound* not to reveal, while the penitent does not *dare* to expose him. We have already had a sample of the filth which Rome administers to the frequenters of the confessional in no illiberal doses. A reperusal of the latter portion of the extract from Dens will remove any lingering doubt that may remain in the mind of the reader.

Actions contrary to the order of nature are set forth on page 60.)

Have you been guilty of any pollutions? Of any irregularity in order to hinder your having children? How often?

(See pages 42 and 43.)

Have you taught any one evil which he knew not before, or introduced any one to lewd houses, etc.? How often?

Have you willingly taken pleasure in unchaste thoughts or imaginations? Or entertained unchaste desires? Were the objects of your desires maids or married persons, or kinsfolk; or persons consecrated to God? How often?

Have you taken pleasure in the irregular motions of the flesh? Or not endeavored to resist them? How often?

(The reader is referred to page 37.)

Have you had the desire or design of committing any sin? Of what sin? How often?

Have you neglected to get your children well instructed in their own religion? Have you sent them to heretics or godless (public) schools?

Have you exposed their innocence to danger, by letting them sleep together without distinction, or by taking them to your own bed, or keeping them in the same room, when already old enough to be scandalized? How often?

Have you allowed them free intercourse with the other sex; to receive visits alone and at improper hours; or to be out late at night? Have you permitted them to read romances or other pernicious books?

Have you treated your wife with attention and forbearance in the time of her pregnancy? Have you corrupted her mind by your immodesty and wicked conversation? How often?

Have you tempted or forced her to offend God? Have you treated her in a gross, tyrannical, and cruel manner? Have you beat her in your anger or drunkenness, or injured her by any other outrage? How many times?

Have you made her unhappy by your neglect, coldness, and unfeeling conduct, or by spending your leisure hours away from home? Have you neglected to provide for her maintenance and that of your children? Have you squandered her earnings and your own on your sinful pleasures?

As a Wife.—Have you refused your husband his marriage rights? How often?

(See pages 39 and following.)

Have you not persuaded him to offend God against the dictates of nature and of conscience? How often?

Have you been respectful and obedient to him in everything reasonable? Have you made his home disagreeable and his life unhappy by your ill-temper and scolding tongue? Have you been idle and neglectful of your household duties?

Have you stolen money or other property? What was it? Have you it still in your possession? What was it? How much at a time? How often?

Have you stolen anything consecrated to God, or from a holy place?

(This is sacrilege, an example of which has been quoted for us on page 44.)

Have you charged exorbitant prices? Have you made out false bills? Have you cheated in weight, measure, or quality of your goods, under the excuse that others do the same? Have you otherwise cheated in buying or selling?

Have you cheated at cards or other games? Or on a still grander scale, by means of deceitful speculations, associations or other enterprises, entered into in bad faith and to the injury of the simple and unwary?

Have you defrauded your creditors? Have you received exorbitant interest for your money? Have you been guilty of forgery? Or passed counterfeit money or broken bill's?

Having found things of value, have you kept them without the necessary pains to find the owner?

Having been trusted with money, have you kept back a part for yourself? How much, and how often?

Have you failed to return things borrowed? Have you bought or received things which you knew or believed to be stolen? Have you taken charge of them, or allowed them to be kept in your house?

Have you been guilty of fraud or embezzlement in any public office or private trust? Have you taken part in the theft, fraud, or injustice to others? Have you concealed when it was your duty to inform?

Have you attempted, intended, or desired to rob, or steal, or defraud, or commit any kind of injustice? How often?

Have you been guilty of lying? Have you given false testimony before any tribunal or magistrate? How often?

Have you carried on an unjust lawsuit, or advised others to do so? Have you sought to gain your cause by bribery, threats, or other corrupt means? Have you procured false testimony, and how?

Have you signed any false papers or documents? Have you falsified accounts, letters, or other writings? What injury have you done by these sins? How often?

If you keep a Hotel or Bar.—Have you charged more to your guests than was just? How much, and how often?

Have you adulterated your liquors? To what amount, and was this a regular practice?

Have you given drink to drunkards, or to those already drunk, or allowed them in your house to drink to excess? How often?

Have you served those whom you knew to be ruining their family by their dissipation?

Have you made others drunk, or sought to make them so? Have you gloried in having made them so? How often?

Have you kept your house open during divine service (the Mass), or made it a place of dissipation on Sundays? How often?

Have you allowed gambling in your establishment, or tolerated blasphemy, obscenity, and other wicked discourse? Have you permitted loose women to lodge in your house? Has it been a place of scandalous interviews or other shameful immorality?

Have you allowed in it immoral shows or concerts, drunken festivity, and dangerous dances? How often?

Is your business an occasion of sin to your neighbor, of harm to your children, and a hinderance to your own salvation?

After you have confessed your sins, conclude your confession with the following words: "For these and all my other sins which I have forgotten, I am heartily sorry, and I humbly ask of you, Reverend Father, penance and ab-

solution, if you think me worthy." Listen humbly to whatever your confessor may have to say; pay attention to the penance which he imposes upon you for your sins; and when you perceive that he is about to give you his absolution say the Act of Contrition.

In the first four centuries, for some sins men were required to do penance during the whole of their lives, and absolution was only granted to them in death; and should they recover after having received it, they were compelled to resume their old position of shame and sorrow. The common course of penance consigned men for ten, fifteen, or twenty years to its various humiliating stages, so that to repeat such a process would have required a considerable life (says Cathcart), as well as a change in church regulations. The Council of Trent issued the following canons on penance:—

"If any one shall deny that three acts are required for the whole and perfect remission of the sins of a penitent, as the substance of the sacrament of penance, that is to say: contrition, confession, and satisfaction, which are called the three parts of penance; or shall say that there are only two parts of penance, the terrors struck in the conscience when the sin is avowed, and the faith conceived from the gospel or absolution, by which any one believes that through Christ his sins are remitted; let him be accursed."

"If any one shall deny that sacramental confession was either instituted by divine authority, or that it is necessary to salvation; or shall say that the secret mode of confessing to a priest alone which the Catholic Church has always observed from the beginning, and still observes, is foreign to the institution and appointment of Christ, and is a human invention; let him be accursed."

"If any one shall say that in the sacrament of penance it is not necessary by divine command, for the remission of sins, to confess *all and every mortal sin*, of which recollection may be had, with due and diligent premeditation, even *secret offences*, and those which are against the last two precepts of the decalogue, and the circumstances which

change the species of sin; but that this confession is useful only for instructing and consoling the penitent, and was formerly observed only for imposing canonical satisfaction, or shall say that those who desire to confess all their sins, wish to leave nothing for the divine mercy to pardon; or finally that it is not lawful to confess venial sins; let him be accursed." (Butler's Catechism says: "The chief mortal sins are seven: pride, covetousness, lust, anger, gluttony, envy, sloth.")

"If any one shall say that sacramental absolution, by a priest, is not a judicial act, but a mere ministry to pronounce and declare that sins are remitted to the person making confession, provided that he only believes that he is absolved, even though the priest should not absolve seriously, but in a joke; or shall say that the confession of a penitent is not required that the priest may absolve him; let him be accursed."

"If any one shall say that the whole penalty together with the guilt is always remitted by God, and that the satisfaction of penitents is no other thing than the faith by which they apprehend that Christ has made satisfaction for them; let him be accursed."

"If any one shall say that priests, who are in mortal sin, have not the power of binding and loosing, or that priests are not the only ministers of absolution let him be accursed."

"The holy Synod (of Trent) teaches that the form of the sacrament of penance in which its force especially lies is placed in the words: 'I absolve thee,' etc. And this absolution is not in words merely, for the Catechism of the Council of Trent says: 'But the ministers of God truly as it were absolve.' And the same Catechism gives the priest authority for this or any other act in the confessional by declaring that he represents Christ in it; and therefore is invested with divine attributes and powers. The words are: 'Moreover in the priest who sits a legitimate judge over him, he should venerate the person and power of Christ the Lord; for in administering the sacra-

ment of penance, as in the other sacraments, the priest discharges the office of Christ.’”

“The Catechism of Trent teaches that ‘priest and penitent should be most careful that their conversation in the confessional be held in *secret*; and hence, no one can, on any account, confess by messenger or letter, as in that way nothing can be treated secretly.’”

“The Catechism of the Council of Trent says that ‘Confession should be enjoined on a child from the time when he has the power of discerning between good and evil.’ And it declares that: ‘Above all, the faithful should be most careful to cleanse their souls from sin by frequent confession.’”

“It declares that ‘Theologians give the name of satisfaction to express that *compensation* by which a man makes some reparation to God for the sins he has committed.’”

“Without contrition, confession, and penance, there can be no perfect remission of sin. Confession of sin to a priest is necessary to salvation. All and every mortal sin, even the most secret and infamous, must be confessed to a priest, or there can be no pardon from God. The priest is the judge of the soul, and in the confessional sitting instead of Jesus Christ, he can keep the sins of any man bound upon him, or loose them, according to his discretion. God never remits the sins of a man through faith only, says the twelfth canon of the Council of Trent on penance.” (*Cathcart.*)

WHAT IS ABSOLUTION?

Absolution is the sentence pronounced by the *priest in the place of God, forgiving the sinner who has confessed his sins.*

He does what Jesus Christ would do if He were upon the earth. For the priest is sent by Jesus Christ, the Son of God, with the same power to remit sins with which he himself was sent by His heavenly Father.

It is absolutely certain (says *Cathcart*) that the form of absolution now in use, “I absolve thee,” was not known

in the practice of Christians till the commencement of the thirteenth century. It was, down to that period, a *prayer* for remission and absolution. Thomas Aquinas, about the year 1250, was one of the first who wrote in defence of the form “*absolvo te.*” In his day the expression excited opposition, and was an undoubted novelty. (*Bingham, App., letter 2.*)

Bauny. “Absolution may be given even to him who candidly avows that the hope of being absolved induced him to sin with more freedom than he would otherwise have done.”

Caussin, defending the above proposition, says, “Were this not true, confession would be interdicted to the greater part of mankind.”

Question. “When is one obliged to have an actual affection for God?”

Saurez. “It is enough if one loves him before being *in articulo mortis*—at the point of death.”

Vasquez. “It is sufficient even at the very point of death.”

Hurtado de Mendoza. “We are obliged to love God once a year.”

Coninck. “We are bound to *love God* once in three or four years.”

Henriquez says, “Once in five years.”

FRUITS OF THE CONFESSIONAL.

“The Roman Catholics of Albany had, during about two years previously to my arrival among them, three Irish priests alternately with them, occasionally preaching, but always hearing confessions. I know the names of these men. One of them is dead; the other two living, and now in full communion in the Roman Church, still saying mass and hearing confessions.

“As soon as I got settled in Albany, I had, of course, to attend to the duty of *auricular confession*, and in less than two months found that those three priests, during the time

they were there, were the fathers of between sixty and a hundred children, besides having debauched many who had left the place previous to their confinement. Many of these children were by married women who were among the most zealous supporters of these vagabond priests, and whose brothers and relatives were ready to wade, if necessary, knee-deep in blood for the holy, immaculate, *infallible Church of Rome*. There is a circumstance connected with this that renders the conduct of these priests almost frightfully atrocious. There are, in many of the Roman Catholic Churches, things, as Michelet properly calls them, like sentry boxes, called confessionals. These are generally situated in the body of the Church, and priests hear confessions in them, though the priest and lady are only separated by a sliding board, which can be moved in any direction the confessor pleases, leaving him and the penitent ear to ear, breath to breath, eye to eye, and lip to lip, if he pleases. There was none of these in the Romish Church at Albany, and those priests had to hear confessions in the sacristy of the Church. This is a small room back of the altar, in which the Eucharist, containing, in the Romish belief, the real body and blood of Jesus Christ, is kept while mass is not celebrating in the chapel.

“This room is always fastened by a lock and key of the best workmanship, and the key kept by the priest day and night. This sacristy, containing the wafer, which the priests blasphemously adore, was used by them as a place to hear confessions; and here they committed habitually those acts of immorality and crime of which I have spoken.”

—*Popish Nunneries, by William Hogan.*

“I have seen husbands unsuspicuously and hospitably entertaining the very priest who seduced their wives in the confessional, and was the parent of some of the children who sat at the table with them, each of the wives unconscious of the other’s guilt, and the husbands of both not even suspecting them. The husband of her who goes to confession has no hold upon her affections. If he claims a right to her confidence, he claims what he can never receive—he claims what she has not to give. She has long

since given it to her confessor, and he can never recover it. She looks to her confessor for advice in everything. She may appear to be fond of her husband; it is even possible that she may in reality.

“She may be gentle, meek, and obedient to her husband; her confessor will advise her to be so; but she will not give him her confidence—she cannot; that is already in the hands of her confessor. He stands an incarnate fiend between man and wife, mother and daughter. All the ties of domestic happiness and reciprocal duties are thus violated with impunity, through the instrumentality of auricular confession.”—*Ibid.*

Part of the dying Confession of a Romish Priest of Spain to Anthony Gavín, formerly a Priest of the Romish Church.

“My thoughts have been impure ever since I began to hear confessions; my words grave and severe with them all, and all my parishioners have respected and feared me. I have had so great an empire over them, that some of them, knowing my misdoings, have taken my defence in public.

“As to the sixth commandment, I cannot confess by particulars, but by general heads, my sins. I confess, in the first place, that I have frequented the parish club twelve years. We were only six parish priests in it; and there we did consult and contrive all the ways to satisfy our passions. Everybody had a list of the handsomest women remarkable for their beauty in another parish; the priest of her parish sent for one to his own house, and, having prepared the way for wickedness, the other had nothing to do but to meet her there and fulfil his desires; and so we have served one another these twelve years past. Our method has been to persuade the husbands and fathers not to hinder them any spiritual comfort; and to the ladies, to persuade them to be subject to our advice and will; and that, in so doing, they should have liberty at any time to go out on pretence of communicating some spiritual

business to the priest ; and if they refused to do it, then we should speak to their husbands and fathers not to let them go out at all ; or, which would be worse for them, we should inform against them to the holy tribunal of the Inquisition ; and by these diabolical persuasions they were at our command, without fear of revealing the secret. I have spared no woman of my parish whom I had a fancy for, and many others of my brethren's parishes ; but I cannot tell the number."

Such as these have ever been the results of the confessional, among a superstitious and ignorant people, who firmly believe that their salvation depends upon the priest ; they may be perpetrated to any extent, without danger of exposure. Americans, will you permit your wives and daughters to frequent such an atrocious institution ?

Comparative morality of Protestant and Popish countries, as exhibited in statistics collected by Mr. Seymour from Government returns and other reliable sources, and laid before the British Parliament.

Mr. Seymour also includes in his pamphlet valuable statistics showing the comparative number of committals in many of the European countries, derived from the same reliable sources as those just given. They are accurately delineated in the following table :—

Roman Catholic	Ireland	19 to the million.
"	Belgium	18 " "
"	France	31 " "
"	Austria	36 " "
"	Bavaria	68 " "
"	Sardinia	20 " "
"	Lombardy	45 " "
"	Tuscany	56 " "
"	Papal States	113 " "
"	Sicily	90 " "
"	Naples	174 " "
ENGLAND		4 " "

Of the three most ultra-Popish kingdoms, viz., Naples, Peter's patrimony or Papal States, and Spain, it appears

that the latter bears away the Popish prize. Mr. Seymour could procure no government returns in relation to crime in that *immaculate* land, but quotes a French authority, who states that in Spain the murders and attempts at murder amount, on the yearly average, to about two hundred and fifty to each million of the population ! In this isolated land of darkness it is said that the sale of indulgences and absolutions at the prices set down in the Pope's tariff for crimes still continues to be publicly dispensed by the Roman priests.

It should be added that these returns are given merely in the abstract. In the able pamphlet from which we quote the specifications of the crimes are given, showing how many of the murders were, *e. g.*, parricides, infanticides, assassinations, murders of relations, etc. ; and the information thus industriously collected is, for the most part, taken from the official returns of the several Governments. As for the comparison between them with our own country, the figures will speak for themselves more forcibly than the pages of statement could.

" If we turn to the other crimes, that of illegitimate births, the results are equally melancholy and striking. The following concise summary will enable us to form a judgment on this subject. It refers exclusively to capital cities. The proportion of illegitimate births is :—

In Paris	33 per cent.
" Brussels	35 "
" Munich	48 "
" Vienna	51 "
" London	4 " —

The Pope's government is careful not to publish any criminal statistics relating to *Peter's Patrimony*. It is said, on the authority of Mettamier, that out of 4373 births in the year, 3160 foundlings were exposed in Rome. The proportion of foundlings to births, therefore, was about 73 per cent., or nearly three-fourths.

Placing England and Austria, which may be considered

as religious antipodes, in contrast, it gives us the proportions of illegitimate births in several of the most important cities of the two empires.

“Thus,” says Mr. Seymour, “I take the figures for England from the report of the Registrar-General for the year 1847, as it contains the details as to illegitimate births more fully than the ordinary abstract; and I take the figures for Austria from the Government return in ‘Die Statistik des Oesterreichen Kaiserstaates,’ as published by the Ministerial Secretary in 1852.”

Protestant England.

Bristol and Clifton, illegitimate births about 4 per cent.				
Bradford	“	“	8	“
Birmingham	“	“	6	“
Brighton	“	“	7	“
Cheltenham	“	“	7	“
Exeter	“	“	8	“
Liverpool	“	“	6	“
Manchester and Sal- ford	“	“	7	“
Plymouth	“	“	5	“
Portsea	“	“	5	“

Popish Austria.

Troppau illegitimate births about 26 per cent.				
Zara	“	“	30	“
Innspruck	“	“	22	“
Laybach	“	“	38	“
Brunn	“	“	42	“
Lintz	“	“	46	“
Prague	“	“	47	“
Lemberg	“	“	47	“
Klagenfurt	“	“	56	“
Gratz	“	“	65	“

Showing that, while in Protestant England the illegitimate births are but about six per cent. in the cities named,

they are about forty-two in those of Roman Catholic Austria.

“In Italy the contrast is equally striking, especially when we remember that Italy is the land *par excellence* of the confessional. I shall here set down the five capital cities of Italy, and contrast them with five cities of England in reference to the number of illegitimate births:—

	ENGLAND.	ITALY.
Liverpool	6 per cent.	Turin 20 per cent.
Bristol and Clifton	“	Milan 35 “
Plymouth	5 “	Venice 17 “
Brighton	7 “	Florence 20 “
Manchester	7 “	Naples 16 “
	—	—
	29	108

“It may be supposed that it is hardly fair to compare England, with its acknowledged affection for domestic life, with such countries as Austria and Italy; that England is England, and the Continent is the Continent; that is, that the ways and morals of our own country cannot (looking at the question as a social one) be candidly contrasted with any Continental country. The writer from whom I quote has met that objection by throwing in contrast *two Continental countries* which lie not far from each other, but are as widely separated as Roman Catholicism and Protestantism can make them—Austria and Prussia.

“Thus, even taking the very worst Protestant States, Mr. Seymour finds in Roman Catholic countries a state of things still worse. For instance, in Popish Austria the illegitimate births are forty-five per cent., while in Protestant Prussia they are sixteen.

“I conclude this note by a comparison of the condition of legitimacy in births in these two contiguous countries:—

AUSTRIA.		PRUSSIA.	
Vienna . . .	51 per cent.	Berlin . . .	18 per cent.
Prague . . .	47 "	Breslau . . .	26 "
Linz . . .	46 "	Cologne . . .	10 "
Milan . . .	32 "	Konigsberg . . .	28 "
Klagenfurt . . .	56 "	Dantzig . . .	20 "
Lembach . . .	47 "	Magdeburg . . .	11 "
Gratz . . .	65 "	Aix-la-Chapelle	4 "
Laybach . . .	38 "	Stettin . . .	13 "
Zara . . .	30 "	Posen . . .	16 "
Brunn . . .	42 "	Potsdam . . .	12 "
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	454		158

"In Protestant Norway the proportion of illegitimate births is from seven to eight per cent., while in Popish Styria it is twenty-four per cent. In Sweden the illegitimate births are seven per cent., while in Upper and Lower Austria, with a population nearly equal, they are twenty-five per cent. If, in Protestant Saxony, the percentage rises to fourteen per cent., in Popish Carinthia it amounts to thirty-five. And while in Denmark it is less than ten per cent., in Saltzburg it is above twenty-two. Again: In Wurtemburg, where the Protestants are two-thirds and the Papists one-third of the population, the illegitimate births are about *twelve per cent.*; while in the neighboring kingdom of Bavaria, where the Papists are three-fourths and the Protestants are one-fourth, the illegitimate births are no less than *twenty-four per cent.*"

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF ROMANISM FOR THE CRIMES OF THE WORLD.

(J. B. HULBURT, OTTAWA.)

The various quotations from popes, archbishops, bishops, and priests, asserting that the public schools are "nurseries of crime, the scandals of which they are the scene, making the blood curdle in your veins; a scandal grossly and monstrously immoral, a blot, a blemish, a disgrace on the

country; seminaries of infidelity and fruitful sources of immorality; the children of the public school turn out to be learned horse-thieves, scholastic counterfeiters," etc., are in strange contrast to the statistics of crime. In Ontario the criminal statistics for 1889, pp. 8-10, give the following:—

Prisoners committed:—

Roman Catholics, 4544, 1 in 70 Roman Catholics.
Church of England, 3876, 1 in 94.
Presbyterians, 1610, 1 in 254.
Methodists, 1682, 1 in 350.

Here we have one committed for crime in 70 of the Roman Catholic population; one in 94 of Church of England; one in 254 of the Presbyterians; and one in 350 of the Methodists. The Jews and the Lutherans make the study of the Bible a part of the education of their children, and they have fewer criminals, I believe, than any other class.

The committals in 1889 to the Central prison (Ontario) were 242 Church of England in a population of 366,539; 263 Roman Catholics in a population of 320,000 (in this number were over 100,000 French, of whom very few were committed); 87 Presbyterians in a population of 417,747; and 100 Methodists in a population of nearly 600,000.

The parliamentary reports for Ireland, 1881, give six-sevenths of the criminals to the Roman Catholics; especially is this disparity seen in the case of children. In the industrial and reformatory schools in Ireland in 1833, there were 6,135 Roman Catholics and only 948 Protestants.

A writer in Harper's Magazine for July, 1854, page 162, writing from Rome, says, "That pardon for every crime has its price, is no fiction in the annals of Rome; not that the traffic in absolution is openly indulged or always abused, but that it is in some cases openly avowed, I know, and sermons preached containing the detestable doctrine and the price attached to the greatest crimes against the law of God. Such a one was heard by a friend of mine, in Spain, in which the tariff was distinctly laid down. Good priests of every persuasion will reprobate this evil;

but the Church of Rome, from which it sprung, still permits a practice so fruitful in profit to her treasury," and of crime, the writer might have continued, as is witnessed in all Papal countries, and especially in Spain.

This tariff, which was first established by Pope John XXII., in 1316, and first published by Pope Leo X. in 1514, has gone through many Latin and French editions since. It has been translated into English, and an edition of it was published by *Barrett and Jones*, in Philadelphia, in 1846. Whoever wish to make themselves fully acquainted with the gigantic enormities and blasphemous pretensions of "the man of sin," should read this book. It comprises a list of perhaps five hundred to eight hundred crimes, contained in seventy chapters, with the regular prices of absolution for their commission affixed. The following are a few of these, taken almost at random from the work:—

"Absolution for one who has killed his father, his mother, his brother, or his wife, if he is a layman, is 1 ducat and 5 centimes." (About one dollar.)

"If there are several accomplices mentioned in the absolution, the tax is full for the first, and reduced one-half for the second."

"For a layman who kills a priest, the pardon must be had *in form* accompanied with *public penance*, and he must pay for a single murder 6 tournois and 2 ducats." (About 25 or 30 dollars.) The murderer may change his public penance to a secret one by paying 18 tournois, 4 ducats, and 9 centimes. The killing of a bishop is fixed at 36 tournois and 9 ducats. One bishop, therefore, equals *six priests* in Rome's assessment, or *one hundred and fifty laymen*.

"For the murder of a layman the pardon is given *in forma*, and it costs 3 tournois, 1 ducat, and 6 centimes. If several are killed in the same combat, he shall be taxed only for one."

"Absolution for fornication of a priest, 7 centimes. (About 7 cents.) For a layman guilty of the like offence, 8 centimes."

"Absolution for him who shall carnally know his

mother, his sister, or any other relation, or had connection with his godmother, 5 centimes." (Or 5 cents.)

"Absolution for one who shall deflower a virgin, 5 centimes."

"A voluntary but *secret murderer*, who has already taken orders, can obtain a dispensation in consequence to say mass and have benefices, whatever they may be, with a clause Nullius, etc., paying 30 tournois and 9 ducats."

"Absolution for a priest who keeps a concubine, with dispensation to take orders and hold benefices, costs 21 tournois, 5 ducats, and 6 centimes."

This tax-book appears to have been a list of precedents for the guidance of priests, made up from a record of the prices that it had been customary to charge for the absolution of the sins and crimes specified therein, varying in amount, it is probable, according to the ability of the parties who applied for the dispensation, and perhaps other circumstances. This appears plain from the fact that the same classes of crimes are frequently estimated at different prices, as will appear by those enumerated above. It is a feature that pervades the whole book. In the latter part of the list, crimes are generally rated much higher than those of the same magnitude are put down in its earlier pages. These were probably added after the discovery of America, when, in consequence of the great influx of the precious metals, commodities of all kinds became enhanced in price, those of the "man of sin" not excepted.

Bishop Burnet wrote that in his day, "Indulgences are still sold in Spain and Portugal. In Spain, the king, by agreement with the pope, takes all the profits; but in Portugal the king and pope divide them."

In Rome, indulgences are publicly advertised for sale on the door of churches and other places of resort, at the present day.

AVOWED INTOLERANCE OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

The following texts of Scripture, with the accompanying annotations, are taken literally from the different editions

of the Douay Bible, to which they refer. It is needless to remind the reader that the *infallibility* of the Church establishes the fact beyond a doubt that the principles herein avowed can never be abrogated so long as the institution of the Papacy exists; although, for obvious reasons, these notes may have been suppressed in the more recent editions of the Douay Bible.

It will be seen that many of the extracts from the Catholic Scriptures given below are retained in editions printed as late as 1816.

Numbers xxv. 4, Douay Bible, 1633: “— said to Moyses, *Take all the princes of the people and hang them up against the sunne on gibbets: that my furie may be averted from Israel.*”

Note, 1635: “By the assistance of the princes, hang the idolaters.”

Josue iii. 8, Douay edition, 1635: “*And doe thou command the priests that carie the arke of the testament, and say to them, When you shal be entred into part of the water of Jordan, stand in it.*”

Note, 1635: “Conformably whereunto St. Augustine teacheth that kings, in that they are kings, serve God by commanding good things and forbidding evil, not only pertaining to humane societies, but also belonging to God’s religion. To this effect Constantine the Great did manie religious actes; yea, even things which our adversaries usest to their own sense, shew evidently his due submission to his spiritual pastour. As when urged by the Donatists, perverse and importunatie, and being desirous (as St. Augustine testifieth) to bridle so great impudence, he heard and judged Bishop Cecillian’s cause, after other bishops sentence for him against the heretickes, where he both gave judgment agreeable to the bishops, and yet pleading pardon, excused himself for this fact, which had not needed, if he had been the ordinarie or competent judge. Optatus also writeth that the same Emperor Constantine exclaimed against the appellants in these words: O, outrageous boldness of furie! like as in causes of Gentile is wont, they have interposed an appeal. The

like good offices did Justinia and Charles the Great, and manie other Christian emperors and kings, for which they are much renowned in the whole Church, and some have been honored for their religious zeale with glorious titles given to them and their successors. To the kings of Spaine, from the time of Alphonso, king of Castile, above eight hundred years agone, for the expelling the Arians, was given the title of Catholick, as Michael Rittas, a Neapolitan, writeth. To the French king, the title of Most Christian, from the time of Philip the Emperor, about four hundred years since, for expelling the Albigencies; as recordeth Nicholas Gillius. To our King Henry the Eighth, of England, for his booke of the Sacraments against Luther, Pope Leo the Tenth gave the title of Defender of the Faith.”

3 Kings, xxii. 42, Douay edition, 1633: “*Who said to him, Thus saith our Lord, Because thou hast let goe out of thy hand a man worthie to die, thy life shal be for his life and thy people for his people.*”

Note, 1635: “Foolish pitie in sparing a dangerous and common enemy is offensive to God and severely punished by his justice.”

Matthew xii. 29, Douay edition, 1633: “*And he said, We! lest perhaps gathering up the cockle you may root up the wheat also with it.*”

Note, 1633, and edition of 1816: “The good must tolerate the evil when it is so strong that it cannot be redressed without danger and disturbance of the whole Church; and commit the matter to God’s judgment in the later day. Otherwise, were it men (be they heretickes or other malefactors), may be punished or suppressed without disturbance and hazard of the good, they may and ought by public authority, either spiritual or temporal, to be chastised or executed.”

Luke ix. 55, Douay edition, 1633: “*And turning, he rebuked them, saying, You know not of what spirit you are.*”

Note, editions of 1633 and of 1816: “Not justice nor all rigorous punishment of sinners is here forbidden, nor

Elias in fact reprehended, nor the Church or Christian princes blamed for putting heretickes to death ; but that none of these should be done for desire of our particular revenge, or without discretion and regard of their amendment and example to others. Therefore St. Peter used his power upon Annanias and Sapphira, when he stroke them both down to death for defrauding the Church."

Matthew x. 18, Douay Bible, 1633 : " *And to presidents and to kings shal you be led for my sake, in testimonie to them and the Gentiles.*"

Note, 1635, Douay Bible : " In the beginning kings and emperors persecuted the Church, that by the death and blood of martyrs it should grow more miraculously. Afterwards, when the emperors and kings were themselves become Christians, they used their power for the Church, against infidels and heretickes."

Gallatians iv. 29, Douay edition, 1633 : " *But as then he that was borne according to the flesh persecuted him that was after the spirit, so now also.*"

Note, editions of 1633 and 1816 : " This mutual persecution is a figure also of the Church, justly persecuting heretickes, and contrawise, of heretickes (which be the children of the bondwoman) unjustly persecuting the Catholic Church."

2 Timothee iii. 13, Douay edition, 1633 : " *And al that wil live godly in Christ Jesus shal suffer persecution.*"

Note, editions of 1633 and 1816 : " All holy men suffer one kind of persecution or another, being greeved and molested by the wicked, one way or another ; but not all that suffer persecution be holy, as all malefactors. The Church and Catholike princes persecute heretickes, and be persecuted of them again, as St. Augustine often declareth."

Apocalypse xvii. 6, Douay edition, 1633 : " *And I saw the woman drunken of the bloud of the saints and of the bloud of the martyrs of Jesus. And I marvelled, when I had seen her, with great admiration.*"

Note, editions of 1633 and 1816 : " It is plain that the woman signifieth the whole corps of the persecutors that

have and shal shed so much bloud of the just ; of the prophets, apostles and other martyrs, from the beginning of the world to the end. The Protestants foolishly expound it of Rome, for that they put heretickes to death, and allow of their punishment in other countries ; but their bloud is not called the bloud of saints, no more than the bloud of thieves, mankillers, and other malefactours, for the shedding of which, by order of justice, no commonwealth shall answer."

Acts xxv. 11, Douay edition, 1633 : " *For I have hurt them, or done anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die. But if none of these things be whereof thou accuse me, no man can give me to them. I appeal to Cesar.*"

Note, editions of 1633 and 1816 : " If St. Paul, both to save himself from whipping and from death, sought by the Jewes, doubted not to cry for succour of the Roman lawes, and to appeal to Cesar, the prince of the Romans (not yet christened), how much more may we call for aide of Christian princes and their laws for the punishment of heretickes and for the Church's defence against them."

Hebrews x. 20, Douay Bible, 1633 : " *How much more, think you, doth he deserve worse punishment which hath trodden the Sonne of God under foot, and esteemed the blood of the testament polluted ?*"

Note, edition of 1633 : HERESIE AND APOSTASIE FROM THE CATHOLICKE FAITH PUNISHABLE BY DEATH."

" *From what has been regularly defined (by the Church) nothing can be taken away, no innovation introduced there, no addition made ; but that it must be preserved untouched both as to words and meaning.*"—Pope Gregory XVI.'s Encyclical Letter, addressed in 1832 to his bishops and clergy in the United States of America and elsewhere.

MERRY TALES OF THE MONKS. Revised and edited by Stephalius. 12mo. cloth, \$1.00. Paper, illustrated cover, 50 cents.

In the "Merry Tales of the Monks" the monastery doors are thrown open for the inspection of the curious. The Secrets of the Confessional are here revealed. The book is crowded with incident; wit, humor, and satire are afforded channels for a display of their powers.

PRESS NOTICES.

"A party of Benedictines, Carthusians, Augustines, Franciscans, Jesuits, and other orders are assembled in an old monastery and entertain one another with diverting stories of life in the world and in the cloister. The writer shows cleverness and familiarity with history, especially of the religious orders."

Evening Bulletin (Phila.).

"A succession of short stories interspersed with discussions, somewhat witty and often acrimonious. The taste and style belong to past centuries."

Rocky Mountain News (Denver).

"A very queer compilation of monkish tales and legends, seeming to have been gathered from a variety of sources, from the 'Cent Nouvelle Nouvelles' to Boccaccio."

Evening Post (San Francisco).

"As a whole, the book is well worth reading."

Evening Call (Phila.).

"Even monks can tell interesting tales when alone, and when these tales are of their own experience they are doubly interesting."

The Item (Phila.).

"In some respects the book is quite startling and most entertaining. The stories are crowded with incident—wit, humor, and satire being delightfully mixed."

Inquirer (Phila.).

MRS. SHEPHERD'S LIFE-WORK.

MY LIFE IN THE CONVENT; OR, PERSONAL EXPERIENCES OF MARGARET L. SHEPHERD (Sister Magdalene Adelaide), of the Arnos Court Convent, Bristol, England. 12mo. cloth, \$1.25. Paper, 50 cents.

The story of Mrs. Shepherd's life exceeds in interest anything that comes from the novelist's pen. The mystery surrounding this strange woman's past career is now for the first time revealed. Her autobiography may truly be called a confession, which, though frank, contains nothing that could not be read aloud in the sacred precincts of the home. Every American woman should read the thrilling narration of this unprotected woman's adventures. She will then thank the good Father of all for the protection vouchsafed to herself.

THE CONVERTED PRIEST.

REVELATIONS OF A PRIEST: His Own Life and Experiences. By Bishop J. V. McNAMARA, late Priest of Rome. Illustrated. 12mo. cloth, \$1.25. Paper, 50 cents.

Bishop McNamara was once an ordained priest of the Church of Rome. Having discovered the errors and evils of Romanism, he cast it off as an unclean thing, and is now one of the most bitter foes of this so-called Holy Church. The story of his experience is one that will be read with eager and intense interest. He exposes the lives and deeds of the wicked and dissolute priesthood in the most fearless manner, and recounts scenes and incidents with which the people have hitherto been unfamiliar. His work contains revelations that will startle people, and surely awaken them to a sense of the danger that threatens their liberties.

CONFessions OF A NUN.

BY SISTER AGATHA.

PRESS NOTICES.

"CONFessions OF A NUN deals with subjects that are of importance to the students here. *Certain questions are settled in the work* that are discussed among us." Literary Editor *Madisonensis*, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.

"We have pictured for us the inner life of a convent and the confessions of not a few of the nuns. The position of the recluse is attacked mainly on the ground of its unnaturalness. This theory, or truth, as the reader may regard it, will certainly find great favor. The book is destined to commend itself very forcibly to the understanding of all, and will have a large sale."—*Phila. Item.*

"CONFessions OF A NUN is another record of painful experiences in a nunnery."—*Phila. Press.*

"The startling work, CONFessions OF A NUN, which met with so much opposition while passing through the press, has finally been published. All lovers of fair play will be anxious to read this realistic book."—*Phila. Evening News.*

"Live questions of the day need the fearless handling that you have given them. Your book deserves to have a large circulation."—*Extract from a letter to the author.*

"We know that Sister Agatha has written a pure and honest book; despite the threats of her enemies, she has told the truth."—*Sisters M. and A.*

THE BATTLE BETWEEN LIBERTY AND ROMANISM.

In the Clutch of Rome.

BY GONZALES

The dangerous influences exerted by the plottings of Rome are well illustrated in this exciting story of love and passion. It is essentially American in character, the scenes being laid principally in San Francisco and Washington. It demonstrates the fact that convent walls are no protection against Cupid's darts. All who believe in maintaining our present Institutions should read this book.

12mo. paper, 200 pages, 25 cents.

A WORK OF THRILLING INTEREST.

Secrets of the Convent.

This remarkable story of the capture and incarceration of a beautiful young woman, in one of the leading Convents, is told in a graphic and charming style. There are many paragraphs that may not suit the prudish, and many sentiments that should be imbibed by all who are prepared to read the truth, whether it be to their fancy or otherwise. There are some facts in this world that **MUST BE TOLD AND KNOWN.** This book carries on interest beyond mere curiosity.

12mo. cloth, 50 cts. - Paper, 25 cts.

THE JORDAN PUBLISHING CO.,

144 N. Seventh St., Philadelphia, Pa.

All books mailed free on receipt of price.

REALISTIC BOOKS.

SECRETS OF THE CONVENT, 12 mo., paper,	25 cents.
IN THE CLUTCH OF ROME. By "Gonzales."	12 mo., paper, 25 cents.
IS ROMAN CATHOLICISM A MENACE TO AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS? By Sister Agatha, author of "Confessions of a Nun."	12 mo., paper, 10 cents.
A MILLIONAIRE'S WIFE. By B. C. Allen.	12 mo., pp. 350, "A startling story of Philadelphia life, rivals Zola's greatest in realism." — <i>Phila. Item.</i>
MERRY TALES OF THE MONKS. Revised and edited by Stephalius.	12mo. cloth \$1.00
Paper, illustrated cover	50 cents.
CONFessions OF A NUN, by Sister Agatha, 12mo.	
cloth, \$1.00. Paper	50 cents
	"All lovers of fair play will be anxious to read this realistic work."
	— <i>Phila. Evening News.</i>
AWFUL DISCLOSURES OF MARIA MONK OF THE HOTEL DIEU NUNNERY OF MON- TREAL. 12mo. cloth	\$1.00
Paper	50 cents.
MY LIFE IN THE CONVENT; OR, PERSONAL EX- PERIENCES OF MARGARET L. SHEPHERD (Sister Mag- dalene Adelaide), of the Arnos Court Convent, Bristol, Eng. Illustrated.	12mo. cloth, \$1.25. Paper, 50 cts.
REVELATIONS OF A PRIEST: His Own Life and Experiences, by Bishop J. V. McNAMARA, late Priest of Rome. Illustrated.	12mo. cloth, \$1.25.
Paper	50 cents.
THE HORRIBLE BOOK: Extracts from the Theo- logical Works of Peter Dens on the nature of Roman Catholic Confession, and the obligation of the Seal. Revised and edited by Stephalius, Editor of "Merry Tales of the Monks."	12mo. cl. 75 cts. Paper, 25 cts.

For Sale by all Booksellers, or sent by mail on receipt of price by
the Publishers.

THE JORDAN PUBLISHING CO.,

144 N. 7th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.